

election of JOHN M. COULTER, of the University of Chicago, as president; CHARLES R. BARNES, of the University of Wisconsin, as secretary; ARTHUR HOLLICK, of Columbia University, as treasurer; and B. L. ROBINSON, of Harvard University, as councillor. No election having occurred of vice-president and a councillor, the Society proceeded to elect these officers. CHARLES S. SARGENT, of the Arnold Arboretum, was elected vice-president, and F. V. COVILLE, of the Department of Agriculture, councillor.

The council having approved the names of CHARLES H. PECK, State Botanist of New York, and BEVERLY T. GALLOWAY, Chief of the Division of Vegetable Physiology and Pathology, Department of Agriculture, these gentlemen were unanimously elected to membership.

The Society having asked the council to consider the best means of increasing the membership of the Society while preserving rigidly the high standard required by the constitution, the council recommended the appointment of a committee whose duty it should be to see that suitable nominations were made, so that the making of nominations would not go by default as heretofore. With the distinct statement that the making of nominations to membership by this committee shall in no way prevent the making of such nominations by other members, Messrs. Trelease, Atkinson and N. L. Britton were appointed.

Special invitations to the Society to hold its next meeting in Detroit, Denver and Nashville, were read and left with the council for action. Much time was given to the consideration of the question of a winter meeting. After a full expression of the opinions of members had been obtained, the matter was left in the hands of the Council with instructions to determine the feasibility of such a meeting and to appoint it if found practicable.

The Treasurer's report, which was au-

dited and found correct by a committee composed of Messrs. Underwood and MacMillan and Mrs. Britton, showed a balance of about \$700, deposited chiefly in the Institution for the Savings of Merchants' Clerks, in New York. The Council directed that the Treasurer give bond for \$1,000 in any surety company, the expense for the same to be paid by the Society.

The request of the National Educational Association, that a member be appointed to confer with a committee of that association regarding the unification of requirements in botany for entrance to colleges, was acceded to by designating President Bessey to act as such conferee.

On Friday evening the address of the retiring president, William Trelease, to which the public was invited, was given in the chapel of the High School. A good audience listened to the discussion of 'Botanical Opportunity.' By request of the Society the address is published in full in SCIENCE and in the *Botanical Gazette*. The suggestiveness and timeliness of the address is such that the Council directed that 1,000 separates of it be distributed in the name of the Society.

On Saturday afternoon the following papers were read before the Society:

L. H. BAILEY: *The philosophy of species-making*. 15 min.

GEORGE F. ATKINSON: *Some problems in sporophyll transformation*. 20 min.

CONWAY MACMILLAN: *Some characteristics of a fresh-water insular flora*. 1 hour.

N. L. BRITTON: *A species of Eleocharis new to North America*. 5 min.

CHARLES R. BARNES,
Secretary.

BOTANICAL OPPORTUNITY.*

In selecting a subject for the first presidential address before the Botanical Society

*Address of the retiring President, delivered before the Botanical Society of America, at Buffalo, N. Y., August 21, 1896.

of America, which you have done me the honor of requiring of me, I have deviated somewhat from the customary lines of such addresses, inasmuch as I have not attempted to present an abstract of recent general progress in botany, nor any results of my own investigation. Such topics, indeed, are more likely than the one I have chosen to interest an assemblage of specialists like this Society, but as the Society is supposed to have as a principal object the promotion of research, the present has seemed to me a fitting occasion to address, through the Society, the large and growing number of young botanists who may be expected to look to this Society for a certain amount of help and inspiration in the up-building of their own scientific careers; hence it comes that I have selected as my subject 'Opportunity.'

Let us for a moment compare the conditions under which scientific work is done to-day with those prevalent in the past. From a purely utilitarian, and, for a time, perhaps, almost instinctive knowledge of plants and their properties, beginning, it may be, before our race can be said to have had a history, through the pedantry of the Middle Ages with their ponderous tomes, botany, almost within our own memory, stands as the scientific diversion or pastime of men whose serious business in life was of a very different nature. Such training as the earlier botanists had was obtained as being primarily useful in other pursuits than pure research, though there is abundant evidence that the master often enjoined upon the pupil the possibilities of botanical study, and no doubt he stretched the limits of botanical instruction deemed necessary, just as is done to-day in technical schools, in the hope that the surplus might be so used as to increase the general store of knowledge; but, at best, training was limited and research was recreation and relaxation.

But our predecessors, even the generation immediately before us, lived under conditions which made it possible for a man to hold high place in the business or professional world, to accumulate wealth in commerce, and at the same time to devote much time to the study of nature. To-day the man who is not entirely a business man is better out of business, and, with few exceptions, the man who is not entirely a student is little better than a dilettante in science. Concentration is the order of the day, and specialization is the lot of most men. But specialization, the keynote of progressive evolution, is always intimately associated with a division of labor. Fortunately, the men who enter and win in the great game of commerce and manufacture see in a more or less clear way that nearly every great manufacturing or commercial advance has grown out of a succession of obscure discoveries made by the devotee to pure science, often considered by him, indeed, only as so many more words deciphered in the great and mysterious unread book of Nature, but sooner or later adapted and applied for the benefit of all men by the shrewd mind of a master in the art of money-making. To these men, successful in business, we owe it that to-day not only are some men able to devote their entire time to scientific research and the propagation of knowledge, but that their work is done under favorable conditions, and with a wealth of aids and adjuncts that would hardly have been thought of a generation ago.

Instead of a smattering of systematic botany and organography, given as an adjunct to chemistry, medicine or engineering, the student who wishes may to-day equip himself for a life of research in botany, by a considerable amount of preparatory work in the lower schools, beginning, perhaps, even in the kindergarten, and by devoting the larger part of his un-

dergraduate time in college to the elements of the subject in its broadest, and, if he wish, technical scope, having the benefit of marvelously detailed appliances and a broad knowledge of general facts. If he can and will work for a higher university degree, thus equipped, he may delve into the depths of the most limited specialty, guided for a time for those who have already broken soil there, and left at last with a rich and unexplored vein for his own elaboration. With this training, if he be fortunate in securing a position offering opportunity for research, or if he enjoy independent means, he may hope for a life-time of more or less uninterrupted opportunity for unearthing the wealth of discovery that lies just within his reach.

Considering the prevalent conditions, my subject naturally divides itself into two quite distinct parts: the opportunity of institutions and of individuals. We stand to-day, apparently, at a transition point. Most of the active workers of the present time are college professors, who have done the research work that has made their names known, during the leisure that could be found in the year's routine of instruction or during their long vacations, and with facilities nominally secured for class use, or, in many instances, like those of a generation ago, the private property of the investigator. Even when appreciated at something like its true value, their original work, for the most part, has been closely watched to prevent it from encroaching upon the first duty, class work; and in most cases the facilities that they have been able to bring together are in direct proportion to the number of students attracted to their departments, and, therefore, in inverse ratio to their own leisure for research. But, as I have already stated, the feeling is growing among men able to foster such enterprises that research is a thing worthy of being promoted, and we have before our

eyes the spectacle of a gradually unfolding class of institutions in which investigation is not only tolerated but expected, either as an adjunct to instruction, as in the greater number of colleges, as a concomitant of educational displays, as in botanical museums and gardens, or, at least nominally, as a basis for technical or economic research, as in several of the larger drug houses, and, notably, in various agricultural experiment stations and the National Department of Agriculture. Perhaps the time has not yet come when laboratories of botanical research can stand out quite alone and justify their existence without reference to other ends, the utility of which is more generally understood and conceded, but it seems safe to predict that the next decade will see their complete evolution.

Opportunity, for institutions, lies primarily in equipment, and secondarily in its use. The problem of equipment for research is a complicated and difficult one. So long as there were no laboratories specially designed for this purpose it was natural that the instructional laboratory should be furnished with appliances for demonstration, and that these should be amplified, as far as possible, for the repetition of experiments, in the first place, and afterwards for their extension; and it is no doubt true that a number of the smaller educational laboratories are to-day over-equipped when account is taken of the possible use to which they can be put. With a specialization such as we now see in progress, it may be questioned whether the ordinary collegiate equipment cannot be reduced in scope in many instances, with benefit to the institution, by releasing money often badly needed in other directions, either in the same or different departments. On the other hand, it is certain that the equipment of the broader research laboratories, whether connected with universities or independent, must be made much more comprehensive

than any which to-day exists in this country.

Under the stimulus of the last two decades, botany has come to the front in most colleges as a study well calculated to develop the powers of observation and the reasoning faculties. Where it still occupies the place of a fixed study of a few terms' duration in a prescribed undergraduate course, it is evident that the necessary equipment of a department is expressible in the simplest terms—for each course, that which is needed to exemplify by the most direct object lessons the subject selected, and enough general and collateral material and literature to complement the work. But the case is somewhat different when, as is now frequent, a considerable option is allowed the student in the courses taken for the baccalaureate degree. Here the temptation exists to secure equipment for the broadest possible series of electives, and it is too often yielded to for the best interests of the institution. However liberal one may be in the matter of electives, it is evident, in most instances, that the student cannot afford to devote more than about one-half of his undergraduate time to a single study like botany, and in this time he can cover only a definite amount of ground. While there is a certain seductiveness in the perusal of long lists of electives in a college catalogue, the serious contemplation of them shows that few, if any, students can hope to take all of the courses of such a list, and as, for the most part, they are garnished out in an attractive form, there is likely to be embarrassment in the wealth of subjects, so that, if left to himself, the student is very likely to select a series of disconnected but pleasing fragments, rather than the proper links in an educational chain. Experience shows the wisdom of limiting the list of electives to those that there is reasonable probability that the student can take, and of making the list a con-

sistent whole, fairly opening up the entire field of botany in such manner as to pave the way for a piece of advanced thesis work at the end, and for specialization after graduation. So far as undergraduate instruction is concerned, where, as is usually the case, funds are limited, it is here desirable, as in the other instance, to limit the scope of the departmental equipment quite closely to the requirements of the courses offered. As the senior thesis work is almost certain to be a further study of some one of the subjects already elected, the provision for it, in nearly every instance, is easily and quickly effected by a comparatively inexpensive addition, in each case, to the standard library and laboratory equipment. Such research work as the head of the department and his assistants find time for, as well as such post-graduate work as may be undertaken, can then be provided for in the same manner, piece by piece, with the exception of the final touches, demanding the use of the larger reference libraries or collections, the provision for which is not likely to be far to seek in the strongest research centers within a very few years.

Great herbaria, broad reference libraries, and large stores of apparatus and living or preserved material, are possible only to few universities and to the still fewer institutions specially endowed for research, to which alone, indeed, they seem strictly appropriate. For the latter, every shade of breadth of foundation is possible, from the laboratory and library limited to the narrowest specialty, to the institution founded and equipped for research in any branch of pure or applied botany. Fairly perfect equipment of the former class it is possible to find here and there, to-day, but though the seed is sown in several places, the broadest institutions, in their entirety, are still to be developed.

No doubt the first requisite in any such in-

stitution is a library of scope comparable with its own. Whatever may be said against the prevalent nomenclature discussions, it must be admitted that they are having the effect of bringing to the front the half-forgotten work of many of our predecessors, some of which, at least, is well worthy of resurrection, and, incidentally, this is stocking our larger libraries with a class of books which have confessedly been too much neglected of late. Without for a moment losing sight of the fact that botany is a study of one branch of Nature—an object study—we must recognize that its prosecution beyond the merest elements is not only greatly promoted by but almost dependent upon a knowledge of what has already been done.

Where an institution is located in a literary or scientific center, closely associated with large general libraries, learned bodies and the like, it is usually relieved of the necessity for purchasing and keeping up the long files of such serial publications as the journals, proceedings of societies, etc., of mixed contents, which prove expensive alike in cost, binding and space, which for a given subject are used but seldom, and which, nevertheless, are the most valuable part of a large reference library, since they are hardest to duplicate. But where a botanical institution stands in absolute or comparative isolation it must carry this burden in addition to that of maintaining a library of treatises on botany alone. And, moreover, no sooner is research begun in any direction than the necessity of following up divergent threads running in many directions becomes evident; for so close and complex are the interrelations between things in organic nature, that no single subject can be pursued far without drawing in others at first sight having no possible bearing on it. After the serials, which from their expensiveness can be possessed by only the larger libraries, stand undoubtedly the general

classics in the several subdivisions of botany, followed by the more restricted memoirs, and among these, for convenience of use, should be found, whenever possible, separates and reprints from the journals and series of proceedings, even when the latter are complete on the shelves.

Next to books, material preserving records, or available for study, forms the great foundation in any research institution. A generation ago, or even less, this expression would have been taken as synonymous with an herbarium, perhaps associated with a garden of greater or less extent; but to-day the most comprehensive of museum possibilities must be added, so greatly has the subject broadened and increased its needs. For a broadly-planned institution, with ample means, no doubt the scope of the herbarium should be as great as that of the library, comprising every group of plants, representing a wide range of geographical distribution, the effects of cultivation, etc.; and, however limited they may be at first, such museum accessories as alcoholic material, large wood and fruit specimens, and sections for microscopic study, are sure to accumulate quite as rapidly as they can be cared for suitably, and to prove in time a very important part of the equipment. Though some of the best botanical work has been performed entirely in the herbarium, there has long been a growing conviction that for certain groups of plants, even for purposes of description and classification, field observation is absolutely necessary, while it is self-evident that for all studies of biology living material is essential. Side by side with the herbarium, then, and virtually as a part of the same general collection, stands the experimental garden, with its greenhouses and other appliances.

While many of the most useful studies are made with but few aids beyond the library and collections referred to, there is a

large class of subjects, now being closely followed by some of the keenest investigators, which demand a special instrumental equipment. However it may be with library and collections, there seems little doubt that, as a rule, apparatus should be obtained only as it is needed for direct use. Except for the rotting of the bindings observed in the libraries of manufacturing cities, and where illuminating gas is used, books, when once classified and indexed, are easily and cheaply kept in a usable manner. If a few simple rules are followed, herbarium material is also preserved safely for generations at a very small cost; and even sections, and specimens in fluid if properly preserved in the first place, may be kept for many years without great deterioration. Instruments designed for research, as a general thing, represent a considerable sum of money, since, excepting microscopes, microtomes and balances, they are rarely made in numbers allowing any great economy in the labor of manufacture. Each of them is also, unfortunately, with few exceptions, calculated for a restricted class of experiments and likely soon to be greatly modified. Apparatus, moreover, is usually of a delicacy of adjustment calling for the greatest care in handling it and the most perfect protection possible against rusting, etc., so that, as a general thing, a case of instruments ten years old is merely a historical curiosity, in part entirely out of date and for the rest so badly out of order as to be nearly or quite useless. Except for a few standard instruments, I think it is now generally recognized that this part of the facilities, however costly it may be, should be regarded as transient, perishable material, rather than a permanent equipment. The history of the most successful physiological laboratories—in which delicate apparatus is chiefly used—furthermore shows that the most important results, as a rule, are not obtained by the use of commercial instruments, but

by simple apparatus designed by the investigator to meet the precise needs of the problem with which he is busied, and usually constructed by him or his laboratory mechanic at very little cost.

Although it seems comparatively easy to decide on the proper limits of library, herbarium and instrumental equipment for a given institution, knowing its scope, situation and resources, it is very difficult to arrive at as satisfactory a conclusion concerning the extent of the research garden. As a general thing, such gardens are also intended to be useful in college work, or to afford pleasure and instruction to the public, so that they are likely to be heterogeneous, almost of necessity, and usually they are made far too comprehensive. More than any other class of facilities, garden plants require constant and expensive attention if they are to be kept in usable condition; and with all of the care that can be given them, they are forever performing the most inexplicable and unexpected gyrations with their labels, so that the collections grown in botanical gardens (because of their variety) are notoriously ill-named, though it would naturally be supposed that they, of all collections, would be above suspicion in this respect.

My object being to speak of facilities for research, rather than education or entertainment, I ought to pass by this part of the subject with a mere mention; but I can hardly dismiss it without comment. Where the only object is to supplement the facilities for undergraduate work, the scope of a garden can be very small or moderately large, according to the courses it is to help elucidate. It may be confined to what may be called a propagating bed for plants needed in quantity, either in season or out of season, for class use, to an exemplification of the natural affinities of plants, or to various other instructive synopses, representing medicinal plants, fibre plants, forage plants,

fruits, vegetables, timber trees, nut trees, shade trees, carnivorous plants, climbing plants, the sleep of plants, pollination, dissemination, etc., or it may be devoted to several of these combined. If it is to be a pleasure ground as well, not only should the art of the landscape architect be invoked in the arrangement of the plants, but it is necessary to add collections of decorative shrubbery and a large variety of purely ornamental florists' forms of herbaceous plants. If research is added to its aims, the collection must be further augmented by specially selected groups cultivated from time to time as needed for study.

Unfortunately, few, if any, gardens are so richly endowed that they can cover, in a satisfactory manner, the entire field indicated, or even any large part of it. From what has been said of the peculiar difficulties pertaining to the maintenance of botanical gardens, it is evident that in no other line of facilities, whether for pure research or not, is a wise restriction so necessary as here. Once properly prepared, a species is represented in the herbarium on one or more sheets of paper safely and economically stored away in a pigeon hole; but in the garden it is a constant source of care and expense so long as it lasts. Hence it is possible for one of the larger herbaria to contain representatives of more than half of the 200,000 species, more or less, of phanerogams, and a considerable, if smaller, proportion of cryptogams, while it is absolutely impossible for anything like this number to be represented in a living state in the best garden. No doubt the local requirements of every institution will do more to influence the exact scope of its living collections than any theoretical considerations, but it is certain that in most cases the greatest usefulness combined with the minimum expenditure will be reached by adapting the synopses chosen to the chief aims of the institution, as closely as pos-

sible, and very rigidly restricting the species cultivated to the smallest number capable of adequately expressing the facts to be shown. Perhaps it is safe to say that an institution able to maintain a herbarium of half a million specimens, representing one-fifth as many species, is doing exceedingly well, if it has in cultivation at any one time 10,000 species of the higher plants; and there are very few gardens which actually grow half of this number, while no inconsiderable percentage of the plants cultivated are so deformed, distorted, dwarfed, and imperfect, as a general thing, that they can scarcely be said to represent the species whose name they bear, either in appearance or technical characters.

This leads to the conclusion that not only class gardens, but research gardens, should be kept within reasonably narrow bounds, so far as permanent planting is concerned, while allowing sufficient elasticity for rapid and ample temporary expansion in certain directions along which work is planned. This does not necessarily mean that any considerable amount of land not used in the permanent plantation need be reserved for special expansion. As a rule, the more important gardens are situated in or near large cities, and the high price of land alone would prevent such reservation in most instances; but the impure atmosphere of many of the larger cities is a further and even a stronger reason for selecting, for any large experimental undertakings, a suitably located and oriented tract of farming land, easily rented for one or several years at a relatively low figure. Granting the wisdom of such temporary adjuncts to a research garden, a step further leads to a recognition of the possibility of securing the most varied climatic conditions by establishing branch gardens located where particular kinds of study can best be carried on. In no other way can gardens be made to contribute to the fullest extent

to the study of marine or seaside plants, alpenes, or the great class of succulents, etc., characteristic of the arid regions of our Southwestern States and Territories, and in no other way, except in the field, can these groups be studied satisfactorily, even from the standpoint of the classificatory botanist.

Undoubtedly, too, the research institution of the future will count as a part of its legitimate equipment, the provision, as needed, of very liberal opportunities for its staff to visit even distant regions for the study, in their native homes, of plants which cannot be cultivated even in special gardens in such a manner as to be fully representative.

If the entire equipment here sketched in outline is not only appropriate, but essential to the great centers of botanical investigation that are making their appearance as results of the specialization and division of labor that are now manifesting themselves in the endowment of research, it by no means follows that every institution, even of this class, should try to develop from the start on all of the lines which, intertwined, compose the complex tissue of botany. With ample means, the ideal development is that which from the beginning recognizes all branches as of value, and classifies and develops them alike in proportion to their relative importance. But to secure the greatest return for the money expended, it is desirable to equip fairly well before increasing the force of salaried men much beyond what is needed for the care and arrangement of the material accumulating. This principle, if followed out, almost forces an over-development in the branches of special interest to the earlier employees—a departure from the ideal symmetry which is sure to be justified by the performance of more work in these hypertrophied specialties, with reference to the sum invested, than in

other directions. From this may also be drawn the seemingly just inference that where the means are limited it is far better to concentrate the entire equipment on the specialties of the persons who can use it than to allow them to work at a disadvantage through an effort, however commendable it may at first appear, to secure a symmetrical equipment.

With the evolution of centers of pure research will appear new problems. Just as the attendance of a large number of students in the botanical department of a college has heretofore been found to justify the acquisition of facilities beyond the power of their immediate use, it will be found that where research institutions exist in close connection with a university of recognized standing, their equipment will be utilized more or less fully in post-graduate work done toward the acquisition of the Doctor's degree, so that, like the undergraduate equipment, it will be more or less satisfactorily accounted for by the number of candidates for such degree; but with broadly grounded and well endowed research institutions not so situated, it is inevitable that as they take permanent form on the lines calculated to make them available for advanced research in any line of botany, they will sooner or later come to represent a very large sum of invested money, of which only a part is usefully employed at any given time, the remainder being held as a necessary but temporarily unproductive reserve. The same thing is seen, to a certain extent, in all large libraries and museums; but, unlike the general library, of interest to the entire reading public, or the collection of historical or political works, referred to by many people of ordinary intellectual attainments, the advanced equipment in botany, for the most part, is useful and interesting only to botanists, so that, while it may possess a passing interest for the general student, its

serious use is limited to a very restricted class. How to increase this use to the maximum may well demand our best thought.

No doubt, just as many colleges now offer scholarships, making their advantages available to men who otherwise could not enjoy them, and some of our universities offer fellowships, opening their own post-graduate courses or those of foreign universities to deserving students, the evolution of research institutions will witness some such provision for enabling students who have partially completed pieces of research work to visit and utilize these centers without encroaching too far on the limited savings from the small salaries which, as a rule, are drawn by the botanists of the country. After all, however, the great opportunity of attainment, for such institutions, whether or not connected with colleges or universities, lies in the performance of research work by their own employees; and while, except in the few instances already referred to, and notably in the National Department of Agriculture, to-day there is some hesitancy in recognizing the employment of a staff of investigators as a legitimate part of the maintenance expense of an establishment which does not use a large part of their time in instruction or necessary curator's routine, it is quite certain that within a very few years opinion will have so changed that a considerable number of salaried positions for research work in pure or applied botany will exist; and as these positions will compete with the professorships in the best universities, it seems probable that the salaries pertaining to them will be approximately those paid by the larger colleges.

In addition to bringing together facilities for research and rendering them easily accessible to competent investigators, and maintaining their own corps of workers, engaged in such study, institutions of re-

search have no small field of usefulness opened up as publishers of the results of the work they have promoted. I shall have occasion later to speak of the means of publication from the standpoint of the student who is seeking to bring out his work in the best form; but it also demands consideration from the point of view of the institution. Much difficulty is experienced in looking up the literature of a subject because of the large number of journals, etc., in which references must be sought, and it is probable that at some time or other most workers have impatiently wished that publication could be confined to one or a few channels. Simple as this would render the bibliography of botany, it is obviously impossible; and the amount of work deserving or demanding publication is so great and so rapidly increasing as to leave no doubt that means of effecting the latter must be considerably augmented. To publish the results of good work well is no less commendable or helpful than to facilitate or perform such work. Nor is it less appropriate to an institution such as I have in mind. The object of publication being the adequate preservation and diffusion of a record of the results of research, however, it is easily seen that harm may be done by injudicious or ill-considered publication. While a volume of homogeneous contents may be so published almost anywhere as to accomplish its purpose, a serial publication ought to be started only when there is reasonable probability that it will persist for a considerable length of time. Granting this probability, a research institution with adequate funds forms one of the most satisfactory and effective agencies of publication, since it can place its proceedings or reports in all of the principal libraries of the world, a thing which the journals do not always accomplish; and not only can it thus amplify its field legitimately, but almost of neces-

sity it must assume the duty of publication if it is to accomplish the greatest results possible from its direct investigation.

One has only to pass a short time in the library of one of the larger scientific institutions to be convinced that a great deal of activity is manifested in the botanical world. Each month and each week brings many additions to the literature of the science, and so numerous, varied and widely scattered are these contributions that one feels the greatest hesitancy in publishing on even the most restricted subject, lest others should have antedated his discoveries. Yet, notwithstanding the variety and number of botanical publications, and the great progress which is undeniably made every year, it is a matter of frequent comment that the progress made is by no means so much greater than that of our predecessors as might be expected, considering the greater advantages under which work is prosecuted to-day. While it must be borne in mind that the seizing of the general features of a landscape is far easier than the working out of its detailed topography, that the outlining of the field of botany or of its principal divisions could not fail to proceed more rapidly, even under unfavorable conditions, than the elaboration of the details of the many specialties into which it is now broken up, so that less prompt and voluminous results are naturally to be expected now than a generation ago, there is reason to question whether the present returns cannot be increased. How to secure the greatest possible results from the large number of trained men and of men holding or soon to hold salaried positions, and from the large equipment in laboratories, libraries, herbaria and gardens, is a subject deserving of the most careful study, whether viewed from the standpoint of the endower or administrator of an institution of education or research, or from that of the botanist whose reputa-

tion is built up in the performance of the duties assigned to him in such an institution.

While there is every reason to expect large returns from the endowment of such independent departments of research, freedom from the duties of the class room, while leaving more time available for investigation, will not prove an unmixed blessing. I believe it to be the experience of the best investigators in this country that research is promoted by the necessity of imparting some or all of its results in the class room. In no other way, after specializing to the small field in which it seems necessary for most of us to confine ourselves, can one make sure of preserving the breadth of view needed for the investigation of even a limited specialty in the most successful manner. It must be admitted further that the power of application and concentration varies with different men, so that up to a certain point the interruptions introduced by limited teaching or looking after collections in many cases may give fresh zest to the pursuit of knowledge in the time remaining for research. And it may be that at this very point lies the greatest difficulty to be met and surmounted in the development and management of research institutions.

Though there is no doubt that some supervision and pressure are conducive to the performance of the greatest possible amount of investigation, as of other work, since they insure consistent planning and close application, it cannot be overlooked that this is the extent to which scientific work can profitably be crowded. To require more of an investigator than that he shall be reasonably busy with thoughtfully planned study is and has always been antagonistic to the performance of his best work; and the requirement of some institutions that a bulletin shall emanate from each department at stated intervals, while

it insures quantity in publication, generally does so at the expense of quality of attainment. As a rule, genius, which, left to itself, now and then leaps to the most unexpected accomplishments, is most effectively repressed by close supervision. It is tolerant of guidance, but not of the goad; and yet, on the whole, perhaps, both guided and driven, if this is done wisely, it accomplishes most, for in harness it becomes plodding research, which is dull, to be sure, but if persevering, productive of cumulative results which become of incalculable importance. In fact, whether fortunately or unfortunately I shall not attempt to say, the world has come to recognize the slow, but sure progress of research as in the main more desirable than the irregular and intermittent leaps of genius, though the two are closely akin—patient labor over endless facts on the one hand, and broad observation and untrammelled thought on the other.

If, everything considered, it is slow and persistent investigation, rather than sudden inspiration, to which we must look for the accomplishment of the greatest collective results in botany, it is equally true that the individual student is more likely to build his reputation on the summation of the small accomplishments of many days of close application than to arrive at some great discovery by a leap—and this quite aside from the fact that the latter result is entirely impossible to many a man who in the other way may still hope to be of great utility. It has been said that there is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune, and no doubt what is true in the military, literary and commercial world is equally true in the smaller realm of science. In fact, I fancy that each member of my audience has in mind some one preëminent occasion which may have looked small or large at the moment, but the seizing or neglect of which he now sees

marked a turning point in his scientific career. But, it will be seen, it is not of the one great opportunity that I would now speak. Improving it always has marked and always will mark the turning point of life, but unfortunately the bridge cannot be crossed before it is reached, and great as the value of a true and wise friend's counsel then is, it cannot be replaced by any generalities in advance; therefore it is to the countless lesser opportunities, repeated with almost every day that dawns for us, that I turn, in the hope that something helpful may be said of them, and in the firm belief that in them lies the making of any intelligent and indefatigable young man.

To the investigator, breadth of foundation is even more necessary than to the institution founded for his use, for while the latter should endure for centuries, and may be remodeled and improved at any time, he is limited to a single lifetime and can rarely in mid-life or later repair the deficiencies of ill-advised or defective training. Not only should his powers of observation be well developed, but he should be given more discipline in reasoning than is now customary—though the botanists of a generation ago counted among their number several men who are even more widely known as philosophers.

Equipped for the work, and enabled to use the material facilities that others have brought together against the day of his need, much depends on an early and wise formulation of the investigator's plans. Except for the tasks set by a teacher, and really long contemplated by him and carried out by his intelligence, if through the eyes and hands of pupils, few pieces of valuable research are taken up on the spur of the moment, without previous thought on the part of the investigator. They are usually the outgrowth of reflection started, perhaps, by some casual observation or the remark of another, and turning and return-

ing until it ultimately shapes itself into a definite plan. Simple as it may be in theory, few things are more difficult in practice than the formation and inception in early life, inexperienced, and often without certainty of the power of continuance for any length of time, of a plan for a single piece of research work worthy of the devotion of a lifetime; and few and fortunate are the men, even among those who have outlined and entered upon such a task, who are not forced from the path by side issues, or whose lives are not unduly short. More commonly one must be content to choose several smaller subjects, for their own sakes somewhat closely related to one another, if possible, and to follow these up in succession. It is surprising how blind even the sharpest-eyed among us are to all that does not directly interest us, and it is an equal surprise to see how quickly one's eyes open to things which he has once begun to think of and look for. If for no other reason than this, I would again urge breadth of early training, as giving the first impulse to many a series of special observations to be followed up in later life.

Once a subject is chosen, observations accumulate with surprising rapidity, and next to the selection of a subject nothing is so important as system in pursuing it. If we do not see it in ourselves, each one of us can see in others a great waste of energy, resulting from shiftless and ill-considered methods of procedure, by which the mind is so distracted and the memory so overloaded with unessentials and dissociated fragments that those which belong together are not matched, nor the missing bits, in plain view, gathered. How often do we have to return, time after time, and review partial work that we have had to dismiss temporarily from the mind, in which, meantime, has been lost the connection between the completed portion and the continuation awaiting our leisure. A

phenomenal memory may enable one to work in this disjointed fashion without the production of scrappy results or the review of all that has been done each time that the task is resumed; but for those not so gifted, order and method are absolutely necessary, and next to a clear idea of the end aimed at, I should place the immediate making of full and exact notes as their most essential part. Some years since I was privileged to assist Dr. Gray in collecting and republishing the botanical writings of Dr. Engelmann, and it was a matter of surprise to us both, as it has been to others, to see how voluminous these were. Had Dr. Engelmann devoted his entire life to botany, they would have been as creditable in quantity as in quality, but for the leisure-hour productions of a busy professional man, they were truly marvelous. Some years later, when, his herbarium and library having found a resting place at the botanical garden in the development of which he had felt an interest for many years, it fell to my lot to arrange in form for permanent preservation Dr. Engelmann's manuscript notes, sketches, etc., I was far more surprised at the extent of these than I had been on collecting his printed works, for when mounted and bound they form sixty large volumes. In addition to their intrinsic value, these are of more than usual interest as showing the methodical manner in which Dr. Engelmann worked. On his table seems to have been always a bundle of plants awaiting study. As each specimen was examined, its salient features were noted and sketched on the back of an ever-ready prescription blank. When interrupted, he laid his unfinished sketch away with the specimen, to resume his observation and complete his study at the first opportunity, without any doubt as to what had been seen in the first instance. And so from individual to variety, from variety to species, from species to genus, and from

genus to family, his observations were preserved in memoranda that facilitated the resumption of interrupted work at any time and after any lapse of time. In no other way could the odd moments between the daily calls and occupations of a busy physician have contributed so much to botanical knowledge. In no other way could his seemingly small opportunity for investigation have been converted into a great one.

Almost as important as the early selection of a worthy subject for study and the adoption of a method insuring the preservation and use of even the most trivial information bearing on it, is the adoption of suitable library methods. The student whose specialty is small and little explored has mainly the task of observing and reasoning from the facts before him; but in the departments that have long been the subject of study, while a part of the work is already done to his hand, and the prospect is that he can go much further than on entirely new ground, the task of ascertaining and profiting by what his predecessors have done is often a difficult one. Not infrequently the literature of a subject is so scattered as to make it next to impossible to pass it all in review, and at best the task of finding the fragments is one calling for a special faculty. One or more attempts have been made to form general bureaus of scientific information, to which one need only turn if he would be possessed of references to the principal literature of any subject in which he chanced to be interested. Perhaps, as library facilities accumulate at the great centers of research, some method may be found of supplementing them with the skill of expert librarians who shall be able and willing to carry the contents of the library, at least in skeleton form, to those who cannot come to it; but the time has hardly yet come when any American library is complete enough in all branches to offer

this aid with a reasonable chance of doing what it promises, or so manned as to make such assistance possible except at the sacrifice of more valuable direct research.

For the present, then, the investigator must be content to do his own delving into the literature of his predecessors. Fortunately, much of the earlier literature has been sought out by some of the writers on any branch that has been the subject of earlier study, so that, starting with a memoir of recent date, one is guided to others, each of which may bring further references, until, if he have access to the works, almost the entire earlier literature is unearthed. On the other hand, the most recent literature of a subject is always the most difficult to find and use. After a study has been gotten well under way, so that the student is keenly alert to every observation or published item in any way bearing on it, if he have access to a library receiving the principal current journals, he is not likely to overlook any important publication on his specialty which then appears. As a rule, all of the larger papers, at least, are noticed in *Just's Jahresbericht*, generally not more than a year later than that for which the volume purports to be compiled; but as the *Jahresbericht* is always some three years in arrears, it is difficult to prevent notes extending over a period of this duration from being defective, at least for the earlier part of the time, and there is, at present, no means of removing this difficulty, though the plan proposed to zoologists a year ago, and, I presume, tested during the present season, if successful, would be equally applicable to botany.

So far as the final result is concerned, perhaps the manner in which one's work is published is almost as important as the subject selected or the method adopted for its investigation. Alphonse De Candolle, in one of the most helpful treatises ever published in the hope of rendering botani-

cal work methodical and productive,* lays a great deal of stress on the early selection of a form of publication for the results of each important study. This done, the work continually shapes itself to this end. Frequently there is much difficulty in securing the publication of a monograph or memoir in precisely the form and place desired by the author, but there is seldom an insuperable obstacle in the way of publishing any really meritorious work in about the manner wished, provided it is suitably prepared.

In general, it is desirable that works of a given class should be so published that, in seeking one, a reader is likely to learn of another. This appears less important for books than for shorter papers, since the arrangement of independently issued volumes in a library, and the fact that they are catalogued by authors, render it relatively easy to learn of and have access to them; but even here one finds no little convenience in the recognition that a book by a given author on a given subject is quite likely to be listed in the catalogue of a certain publishing house. Smaller papers, which are usually published in the proceedings of some society, or in a scientific journal, may almost be said to be made or ruined by the place selected for their publication. Probably as library facilities increase and are more thoroughly classified and subject-indexed, this will become less true than it now is, though the underlying reason for it will remain. Usually a reader turns to the popular journals only when looking for popularized science, and is not likely to seek the original results of research there, so that such papers are nearly or quite lost for a long time if published in these journals. As research has now become specialized, the journals devoted to the publication of its results have gradually fallen

into line as special journals. Except where they are chiefly devoted to digests and abstracts, few nominally general journals now exist which do not lean so strongly toward a specialty that one unconsciously classes them with it, notwithstanding the extraneous matter that they contain. While nothing once published is ever absolutely lost, all of this extraneous matter is likely to be overlooked by the persons most interested in the subjects considered. No small part of the present confusion and strife in botanical nomenclature arises from the comparatively recent unearthing of descriptions and names of plants published in such improbable or inaccessible places as to have escaped the attention of those whom they might have helped most, to be brought to light at a later date as great mischief makers. From now on, then, it may be concluded that a decreasing number of special papers are likely to be published in general journals, which will become more and more popular or bibliographic in their nature, with the exception that the necessarily slow differentiation of learned societies into special sections will for a long time cause the proceedings of many of the older to continue of the most miscellaneous character. Where papers are lengthy, though not adapted to publication in book form, such proceedings virtually offer the only means of printing them, and except by the comparatively few botanists who enjoy the privilege of membership in purely botanical societies with publishing facilities, they must be accepted for the present, notwithstanding the attendant disadvantages. Shorter papers, however, can usually find room in the journals, and except in cases where they possess a temporary and exceptional value for the columns of a popular or general journal, or one devoted to another subject to which in some manner they are relevant, they are best published in a periodical devoted exclusively to botany, and

* *La Phytographie, ou l'art de décrire les végétaux considérés sous différents points de vue.* Paris, 1880.

in most cases in one devoted as closely as may be to their particular branch of botany, provided it have a fair general circulation, and especially provided it reach the principal botanical libraries.

Especially in the earlier years of their work writers are sometimes given to distributing their papers among a number of journals. Except for the purpose of specialization just referred to, this is usually a mistake. Knowledge that a certain student has published on a given subject is often first obtained through incidental reference, lacking every element of precision. The probability that all of his writings are to be found in one or a few journals or series of proceedings greatly simplifies the completion and use of such references, since the *Royal Society's Catalogue*, though perhaps more complete as to titles, is necessarily even farther behind than the *Jahresbericht*. Where the subject of an earlier paper is again passed in review by the author, only the gravest necessity should lead to the selection of a new medium for the publication of the later paper.

Whether the medium of publication selected or accepted be a journal or the proceedings of a society, the possibility of having separates struck off for the mere cost of press work, paper and stitching, makes it possible for almost any paper to appear as an independent pamphlet, accredited, to be sure, to the journal from which it is an excerpt, but, like a book, necessitating author's citation in catalogues, and admitting of more ready arrangement in its proper place where the works of a library are disposed on the shelves according to subject. The time was when a pamphlet was considered of little value and quite certain not to be preserved, but one of the characteristics of the modern librarian is a great and growing appreciation of the value of this class of works, leading to their careful preservation.

No small part of the volume of M. De

Candolle, already referred to, is devoted to very explicit and well considered directions for preparing the record of one's observations for the press; and the general conclusion is reached, after a careful analysis of the subject, that the maximum value of any manuscript exists at the exact moment of its completion, indicating this as the most suitable time for its publication. Though it is probable that the publishing of any important work should not be unnecessarily delayed after it has been pushed to what the author considers completion—at least so far as he can carry it,—there may be reasons in some cases for publishing a preliminary statement considerably in advance of the completion of the work. Neglecting the publication of an early abstract of unfinished work as a means of securing priority—too often a purely personal matter—I may say that such abstracts, coupled with a request for material or data, not infrequently bring to the advanced student the means of greatly increasing the completeness and value of his work.

Time does not permit me to go into a detailed analysis of the many ways in which an investigator may use his time so as to make it productive of important results for himself and others. Having passed in somewhat comprehensive, though hasty, review, the main factors in the question, I desire, in closing, to repeat that for most of us the opportunity of life does not lie in a great and abrupt change of condition, but that it is composed of countless minor chances which are great only when viewed collectively. To see and use them calls for alert senses, a knowledge and use of the means of ascertaining what has already been done, and, by exclusion, something of what remains to be done, facilities adequate to the task in each case, and indomitable perseverance and ceaseless activity. Great as the value of facilities is, they are merely means to an end. They accomplish noth-

ing themselves. Hence, though it is certain that the most voluminous and, perhaps, the most comprehensive results, and those resulting from the performance of coherent experiments extending through a long series of years, will come from the great centers of research, there is no reason why qualitative results equal to the best may not continue to come, as they have in the past, from isolated workers, to the rounding out and completion of whose studies the facilities of the larger institutions will be more and more applicable as the problems of equipment are worked out.

WILLIAM TRELEASE.

BOTANICAL GARDEN OF MISSOURI.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

SECTION E.—GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY.

SECTION E of the American Association this year virtually included the Geological Society of America. The latter organization held only a short meeting for routine business on the Saturday evening previous to the meeting of the American Association, and referred all its papers to Section E of the A. A. A. S. The total number of papers offered in Section E was 42. The last day of the meeting the Section was divided into two subsections, one dealing with Pleistocene Geology, and the other taking the remainder of the field of the science. Even with this division, the time did not suffice for the full reading of all the papers, and a considerable number of papers whose authors were absent were read by title. While none of the papers recorded any discoveries of epoch-making significance, nearly all of them contained the results of solid and valuable work, contributing, in an important degree, to the advancement of science.

The following is a list of the papers presented:—

- Notes on the Artesian Well sunk at Key West, Florida, in 1895.* By EDMUND OTIS HOVEY.
- The Hydraulic Gradient of the Main Artesian Basin of the Northwest.* By J. E. TODD.
- The true Tuff-beds of the Trias, and the mud enclosures, the underrolling, and the basic pitchstone of the Triassic Traps.* By B. K. EMERSON.
- Volcanic Ash from the North Shore of Lake Superior.* By N. H. WINCHELL and U. S. GRANT.
- The "Augen-gneiss," Pegmatite Veins, and Diorite Dikes at Bedford, Westchester Co., N. Y.* By LEA McI. LUQUER and HEINRICH RIES.
- The Tyringham (Mass.) "Mortise Rock," and Pseudomorphs of Quartz after Albite.* By B. K. EMERSON.
- The Succession of the Fossil Faunas in the Hamilton group at Eighteen Mile Creek, N. Y.* By AMADEUS W. GRABAU.
- Development of the Physiography of California; Synopsis of California Stratigraphy.* By JAMES PERRIN SMITH.
- Ancient and Modern Sharks, and the Evolution of the Class.* By E. W. CLAYPOLE.
- Observations on the Dorsal Shields in the Dinichthyrids.* By CHARLES R. EASTMAN.
- The Discovery of a new Fish Fauna, from the Devonian Rocks of Western New York.* By F. K. MIXER.
- Interglacial change of course, with gorge erosion, of the St. Croix River, in Minnesota and Wisconsin; The Cuyahoga Preglacial Gorge in Cleveland, Ohio.* By WARREN UPHAM.
- A Revision of the Moraines of Minnesota.* By J. E. TODD.
- Notes on certain Fossil Plants from the Carboniferous of Iowa.* By THOMAS H. MACBRIDE.
- Origin of the High Terrace Deposits of the Monongahela River.* By I. C. WHITE.
- The making of Mammoth Cave.* By HORACE C. HOVEY.
- The Colossal Cavern.* By HORACE C. HOVEY.
- James Hall, Founder of American Stratigraphic Geology.* By W J MCGEE.
- Professor Hall and the Survey of the Fourth District.* By JOHN M. CLARKE.
- Sheetflood Erosion.* By W J MCGEE.
- Glacial Flood Deposits in the Chenango Valley.* By ALBERT P. BRIGHAM.
- Origin of Conglomerates.* By T. C. HOPKINS.
- Origin of Topographic Features in North Carolina.* By COLLIER COBB.
- The Cretaceous Clay Marl Exposure at Cliffwood, N. J.* By ARTHUR HOLLICK.
- Post-Cretaceous Grade-Plains in Southern New England.* By F. P. GULLIVER.
- The Algonquin River.* By G. K. GILBERT.
- The Whirlpool-Saint David's Channel.* By G. K. GILBERT.