

plant were distinct, but I had no evidence that you were not the discoverer, ^(in your name) ~~standing~~ in which case it would be particularly proper to call it Grayi. But I hoped at least, in refusing, you would suggest a name, & if a name were to be given should still hope

Lepidium - The winged pods & incumbent cotyledons, as well as different habits, long since proved to me that the plant could not be *L. virginicum*; and now I find that it has no petals and but two stamens. If it is to be included under *L. intermedium*, Gr. and some alteration is to be made in the character, will it be ~~asking too~~ presuming too much to ask you for a Latin description of your own plant, to be published as *your* plant? The plant being rare I think a Latin character should be given.

to letter from Dr. Engelmann. I am sure I have been respectful to him and have not only expressed in my letters my gratitude to him but have indeed felt what I expressed. The only fault I have committed must be that I did not at once answer his letter in which particular information was asked for respecting famous militaris - which I could not give with confidence until ^{I had} its habits again. I presume I have 150 specimens made in all, some very fine. (I send one for Prof. Bigelow) I am "reliable" - am a man of my word - and he will find it so when he writes to me personally. He does not indicate the number he wants. I shall prepare an equal number of printing specimens as well as ^{well enough fit to see} ~~flowers~~ ^{your gratified} ~~of his~~ ^{very} ~~specimens~~.
I had a notice that the *L. glabra* & *muticum* (Gr.) was the same

Worcester, 21st May, 1866.

Prof. Gray,

Dear Sir,

Your letter came to hand Saturday evening. Reluctant as I am to rob you of an hour's time, with your multiplied duties, I can do no otherwise than write to thank for your letter and to make an explanation. The explanation is in regard to my misconception of your opinion formed on the receipt of Prof. Oliver's letter. You had previously said in a note "but we must first be sure about the Turrit's stricta of Gr.", implying doubt in your mind. Then came Prof. Oliver's letter and the enclosed sketch, ~~proving~~ the first glance at which should it to my untrained eye so totally different from the *L. L.* plant in its very strict (*"strictum"*) Gr., broader, though mature, evidently 2-rowed

poes, that I interpreted your remark in the letter "I am right at least in regard to Drummond's (Hooker's) plant" as leaving one plant at least doubtful, as you did ^{not} speak particularly of it. Could Hooker have had our form before him, from Bougain or some other quarter, besides Drummond's plant & have tried to modify his description to cover all? and if he had, would he not ~~have~~ after substituting "striatis" have added saprepatulis and etiam patentissimis? for even the young specimens would warrant the first term & for the older ones et reflexis would not be an untruth. Do none of my 18 panicles are striatis?

Please indulge me & save looking up Graham's article in quoting from him some important points of difference contrasting the 2 plants.

Graham says—"Stem smooth" (always hisute near the base), "branched" ($\frac{1}{3}$ of mine are simple). "Leaves all smooth" (lower and radical ones rough hairy), "entire or very sparingly denticulate" (radical and lower cauline leaves sharply or repand serrate);

"leaves at the root & petioles ciliate with minute reflected hairs" (hairy throughout with branching hairs, very rarely simple & petioles not ciliate). "Radicals erect and like every other part of the plant glabrous" (radicals spreading and all the lower part of the plant hairy). "Segments of the calyx subovate" (decidedly obtuse). "Capsule always erect, subspatulate" (always spreading, linear). "Seeds arranged in two rows" (almost in one row even before maturity). "Germen linear, afterwards dilated at the apex" (not dilated).

These discrepancies seem to me too wide to exist in one and the same species; but if you are of the opinion that Sir W. J. Hooker intended his description should cover both forms I still think our plant should have the name *Arabis Drummondii* Gray &c. I will so write it. It would, I think, be best, from the rarity of the plant to republish Graham's original description & Hooker's variations.

I did not really think ^{you} would like the name *Grayana*, published by us, if the

*Of course he had the ripe fruit. The rubbing shows the two rows.



Robbins, James Watson. 1866. "Robbins, James W. May 21, 1866." *Asa Gray correspondence*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/224681>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/252583>

Holding Institution

Harvard University Botany Libraries

Sponsored by

Arcadia 19th Century Collections Digitization/Harvard Library

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Public domain. The Library considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection

License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

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>.