

other Caryophyllaceous plants. This is more like a case of real *dédoublement* or *unlining*, a partial separation of an inner lamella from the outer, and perhaps may be so viewed." But the close relation of the petal to the stamen, and the many instances of a condition intermediate between the two are well known, and it seems easy and natural enough to regard the crown as an imperfect development of anthers whilst the expansion above it corresponds with the petal-like enlargement of the connective in some stamens, and the claw with the filament. Here then, we need no new principle, and find no real exception to recognised laws. The appendage to the stamen in *Larrea* and other *Zygophyllaceae* is perhaps as good a case as can be found for the application of the stipule theory which has here not a little plausibility, although when we consider the modifications of development in a single petaloid organ as shown in *Ranunculus* with its petal scales, *Helleborus* with its nectariferous cup; some species of *Lilium* with their protrusions on the surface, and again the cases among the grasses of awns which are the midribs of the glumes or paleæ to which they belong, departing at some distance below the apex, we, perhaps, ought not to consider the appearances as inconsistent with the supposition of one organ developed in an unusual manner. Perhaps the appendages at the base of the anther in *Erica* are quite as strange as if they occurred at the base of the filament, and the stamen growing from the extremity of a petaloid process in *Campanula* not much less anomalous than if it rose from the same lower down, or at the base. Then we have the stamen of *Asclepias* with its extraordinary appendages which is as like the unlining of an organ as anything we are acquainted with, yet undoubtedly is no more than a mode of development of the one modified leaf.

The next example is taken from the genus *Parnassia* with its curious and beautiful appendages [nectaries of Linnæus] opposite to the petals immediately within them, and thence inferred to be derived from them, or, as it were, a part of the same organ. These appendages may be some justification of collateral chorisis though the multiplication of parts is incomplete, but I confess I can find no reason for denying them to be a circle of parts originating distinctly in the torus, although they are placed opposite to the exterior circle. I have given reasons for believing that oppositeness alone is no argument for identity of origin in organs, and if it were, the fertile circle of stamens in *Parnassia* must be accounted only a transverse chorisis of the carpels, as the members