

why put together my white or
one-tinted H. spicata & sulphur
yellow + H. hispida? And yet
again my white changing to
one-purple H. oppositifolia and
yellow H. crucilis. For the
sake of consistency put H. spicata
and H. oppositifolia into H. multiglandulosa
if they can not stand by themselves!
But this Calycedonium problem will
I think easily solve itself if you
can be persuaded to give up your
tenacious clinging to akeneo &
pappus, and seize hold of the
well marked differences of habit,
and of chemical properties as indi-
cated by the odor of the foliage,
(which latter character one of the
very best, is not at all available
with you, but you must not
ignore it. It is the character by
which the botanists of the future

Berkeley, Aug. 24, 1882.

My Dear Dr. Gray:-

Your letter
about Hennigonia has just ar-
rived. Some of your conclu-
sions greatly surprise me, and
more than your disposal of
H. Lobii, which I consider as un-
questionable a species as the genus
holds; and I too, have reached my opinion
without having at hand a vast
amount of material of the fascicula-
ramosissima sort, gathered in from
many localities. You have evidently
been misled, first, by the mere portion
of a branch, as to the size and general
aspect of the plant. Had you seen
the specimen, a plant ten feet high
simple up to the middle, then abruptly
parted into a half dozen equal,
irregular, racemose branches, you

would, at the very first glance, have relegated it to the virgata group. You would, on looking closer, have noticed the dense, appressed foliage of the floral branchlets, such as occurs only in H. virgata & H. Hermanni.

Then, going to the chaff of the receptacle you would have found it distinct, each pale half enclosing a sterile awnless, (the good character of that group) like which there is nothing in the fasciculata neighborhood. So you might have thought, perhaps, of making it a few-flowered var of H. Hermanni, but the exactly 3 ray- & 3 disk-flowers, the different shape of the ray-awns & the shape of the disk, make it clearly distinct.

It looks to me that in this instance as in Brit. Cal. when you left the beautifully distinct H. Parryi in with H. Fitchii, & the very clear

H. Hermanni, in with H. virgata, you have slighted things which deserve closer looking into. For H. Gibbi you must, indeed take heavy say for its size & general aspect, but for the leafy branchlets (& that char. as trifl., but a good char of virgata group) and the peculiarity of receptacle-chaff, you can see for yourself, if you will look, and compare with Hermannii.

In your disposal of Calycadenia you appear to me strangely inconsistent with yourself. Why do you keep H. Douglasii, & H. multiglandulosa apart?

Your sole character, so far as I can see is color of flowers. No distinctions of awns & pupae can be found. But if you keep them apart on that ground

will be led in ~~threading~~ this
whole calycadenia maze.)
You, I humbly believe, will
either accept this suggestion
and, taking the word of California-
nians for good, act upon it,
or your work on the subject
will be undone, before your
volume space has become at-
all anticipated.

But even with color of flowers
and habit, you can certainly
do better than, according to your
letter, you have determined on
doing.

H. tenuella, H. spicata, H. oppositifolia,
H. multiglandulosa, + H. cephalotes
are all white or non-tinted.

If you can not recognize differences
of habit, just the flora with me.
But a California school master
might teach children to distinguish

each of the four, blindfold, by
odor of turpentine alone!

I have told you this important
fact before, but you ignore it,
because, I suppose, you can not by
your own experience verify it.
I am so perfectly confident that, in
the two points you insisted on, I
have the key to the enigma, that
I publish in *Sept. Gen. Bull.*

H. cephalotes, whose flowers are
the same color as of H. multiglandulosa,
but whose habit & odor are very
widely different.

So securely do I trust in these points
that I doubt if, in H. Clevelandii's
description I have mentioned
that it says an only half as long
as those of H. ligulifolia. though
I guess I did mention the
peculiar unfolding of the ray-akenes
of the scales, which persists at

but are good technical
distinctive. Even without
that I would trust it to
stand on the difference in
habit, pubescence & odor.

H. lugulafolia is of such a
sickening, filthy odor, that
I dread experimenting with it,
when fresh; but H. Clevelandi
is rather pleasantly aromatic.

I know not & what purpose
I write all this long protest.
But my faith in every one
of my species of this genus,
grows stronger every day, es-
pecially now, when they stand
on in their prime on our
plains & hillsides.

I shall be sending you another
bundle before many days.

As Ever Yours

E. L. Greene.



Greene, Edward Lee. 1882. "Greene, Edward L. Aug. 24, 1882." *Edward Lee Greene letters to Asa Gray*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/225942>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/256058>

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>.