

I have made up my mind to prepare a *Century* of Lich. Nov. Aug. Exsicc. There are some fine things; and my names are right: besides, which I shall send all my plants to Fries. A few copies for distribution is all I intend - W. Greene (Boston 28 Jan. 1844).

nothing will be more satisfactory to Correspondents. I hope if favoured, to complete my stock of specimens, at the White Mts. My dear friend next summer - with Oakes, & I hope to spend there.

You will have time to read this I know. It is

a part of what I want to say - but could not express half as well in conversation. 1st. *The Junci*. I will tell you what stopped me - finally - in my present study of the genus. Meyer has a remark under his *J. paradoxus* that under the American *J. nodosus* of L., many species lurk: - as from the European *J. articulatus*, L. a whole group of species has already sprung to light. Here is the sticky point with me. There are not enough specimens of hardly one of the nodosus group - either in Herb. Torr., or my own collection - to pretend to determine. Nor have I enough of the corresp^d European series (differing as my specimens do of some species, very much from each other) to make up my mind - whether, as Hook & Sprey have begun to do - we should not locate the European series in our Flora - and call our plant *acutiflorus* (as Hook) or *Lamprocarpus* (as Sprey.) - or on the other hand consider ours as a distinct analogous series. I have one specimen of a Cambridge juncus (aff. *polyccephali* Michx. & *scipioidei* Lam.) almost perfectly like one of my specimens of *J. lamprocarpus* - but not like the others. - Have I not put the difficulty in a clear light? Am I not right in concluding that more study of the living plants and large sets of specimens - such as I have seen in no collection - are essential to the unravelling of our *Junci* - which do not need names so much as a masterly revision - which if done in the most thorough way should also settle the foreign species. - How generally does this genus and the exceedingly near *Luzula* seem to have been neglected! Meyer is allowed to stand alone. - Hooker's *J. acutiflorus* α , (β is exactly our *J. acuminatus* and γ Mich. fide Herb. Torr.) is (fide Syn.) *J. petocarpus*, Mey., orig^d descr. from Mass^{ns} specimens. Hooker says he cannot distinguish it from the Europ^d *J. acutiflorus* - but not only will not Kunth's descr. ^{of that sp.} ^{Hooker's} answer to his plants - but I am persuaded the *J. petocarpus* is a very distinct species: though hardly known in this country. It grows at Burlington Vt. - & is therefore incl. by Mr Oakes in his *J. acuminatus* - but I am sure it is very distinct - & will find a place in our Flora hereafter. It is not in Herb. Torr. Hooker's specimens are fr. Arctic America - *J. dichotomus* Torr. herb., Gray! Oakes! is a diff^t plant from Elliott's in many respects - but partic^r in its nodulous leaves, always apparent on dissection at least, - its acuminate - rostrate fruit &c. Elliott's pl. belonged to the flat-leaved section of *J. tenuis* DC. - & a sp. of this section cert^r is ref. to it both by Meyer & Kunth. Our plant agrees with this latter section in its solitary flowers - perhaps more properly in this case we might say one-flowered capitules - but in habit leaves &c it is clearly a member of the other section. I have ventured to call this *J. Conradi* because in Herb. Torr. I find some spec^m ticketed *J. viviparus* Conrad - which viviparous state is very common in this sp. I don't know however whether Conrad put any descr. (in Trans. Acad. Philad.) or whether if he did his name must not be retained, however erroneous; and asked this question of Dr. Torrey in sending him the plant - which I called *J. Conradi* only to denote that I thought it was a distinct species. I sent a descr. with it. Could you give me a word of advice as to this. It being a Plymouth pl. of which I have a stock of spec^m - I am the more desirous to

have it settled - particularly for one reason. Though some inadvertence prof. Kunth told me unhesitatingly when I showed this to him - that it was Meyer's *J. pelocarpus* - and ever since I have given it under this name - with the additional note looking at his descr. - which is ludicrously inappropriate. When known to Wm. Hooker you saw his *J. acutifolius* which Meyer himself pronounced as *J. pelocarpus* I now ~~know~~ ^{believe} that my Plymouth sp. must be studied & fixed: whether as *J. dichotomus* (which I count below) *J. viviparus*, or *J. Conradi*. Found nothing else out except that *J. polycephalus* Herb. Poer. 66 &c is *J. ~~sp.~~* paradoxus, Mey. - and *J. echinatus* S. nodosus is the true *J. polycephalus* Michx. - but previously named *J. Scipioides* by Lamk. - Wednesday. After a careful exam. of specimens of the Cambridge species above referred to - together in black green (caused by rain a doubtful pt.) I think I will venture to say it is *J. tampanaeopus*, Schult. & exal. min. No. 4, is also quite disposed to agree. Its suggestive of the pt. I will here refer to Hooker's H. Scot. where a *J. polycephalus* is enum. among the pt. of Scotland - which plant is in the Brit. Fl. referred to *J. tampanaeopus*. All this is of course very valuable as showing how much our plant seems in the eye of

J. nodosus, L. Sp. Pl. 466, Torn. H. 361. — *J. scirpoidea*, Lam. Encycl. fide Mey.,
Mey. in Linnaea, Vth. Edim. 3. 311. — *J. polyccephalus*, Michx. (fide decr., Knuth Syn. sub)
J. scirpoides, & I.S.C. Greene Obs. in Herb. Torn.) Mey. Knuth June, Curtis herb. (fide specim.)
J. cebrenatus, Willd. herb. (fide Vth.) Muhl. Gram. (fide Mey.) Bott. Amer. pl. Cannon
own?) *J. Rostkoriae*, Mey. Janz. (fide Torn., decr., & ic.) *J. macrostemon*, Gay (fide
Torn.)

Lob. Amer. Septent., merid., ~~monostylous~~ gide Mex. Differs from the European
species as indicated in the observation of L. in loc., — and might for this and the
descri. alone independent of the synonymy with *L. caerulea* Confert — have been safely
pronounced to be L.'s plant as it was by Torrey & Gray & Rostkov. From the latter's figure
Meyer (aparting that many sp. are incl. under the Linnean name) gives it up
(and) makes out his of Rostkovic. — In like manner Michx. makes out his
polycyphalus (scarcely as it did cert. diff. for the European sp., & the Linnean
pl. being taken to be doubtful) and cites the very same figure of Rostkov.
The other synonyms are probably correct. — Our plant is very like in minute
characters to the following but seems always distinguishable by its few dense
globose capitulae more or less echinatish owing to the acuminate sepals, as
well as the sessile capsules.

2. J. paradoxus, Mey. June, p. 30., Lahanp. June, (vide Kt.) Kunth. Enum., 25. Enum.
pl. Cantab. ined., — J. polyccephalus, Pursh (vide herb.) Ill. Carol. (vide May.)
Torr. herb. &c Flora, Gray, of Baker, Greene! Beck! &uct. pl. non Michx.,
Torrey. Darlington! Cest. nov. Willd.

Hab. Amer. Septentrionalis. When the whole history of this plant shall be understood - it may be found to belong to the last species - but is conveniently kept distinct - and is distinguished from the last by its smaller heads and supraredecim-petaled panicle - and from the allied foreign species by its crenulate scales &c - as see the last sp.

J. lamprocarpus, Thw. cit. auctt. Kunth Emend. Distinguished by its
Lab. near Boston; Herb. Greene, Cambridge; 2 ft. — differing from the last in its
smallest dense chocolate-col'd heads — and differing from the last in its
sepals which are not acuminate — the outer ones mucronate & the inner obtuse;
they refer to Sprigel (Neu-Entd.) as having pronounced *J. lamprocarpus*
an American plant, but says quite positively that he has never seen "genuinum"

J. longicarpus specimen Americanum". I am willing to take the risk of saying that my Cambridge plants and those of Herb. Greene belong to *J. longicarpus*, whether or no. 4. *J. pelocarpus*, Mey. Lurz. Add. p. 30, fide Herb. Hook!, Kunth. Enarr. *J. acutiflorus*, a look! Bop. Amer. non Mey. fide Mey. — *J. longicarpus*, Spreng. l.c. fide Mey. non Mey. fide ips. nec Austin.

Hab. Amer. Antica, Hooker! Burlington, St. E. ! Niagara, Herb. Greene !
differs very much in habit & *J. acutiflorus* and in its Sepals as they are
descri. by Meyer & Kunth. From *J. lapponicus* it is pronounced by Meyer
& seems distinct - but belongs apparently to this species rather than any
other. It is not said to be distinct.

for examination and study.

J. pallidus, Lam. (var. *acutiflora* (fide Mey. ex specim. Lam.) Mey. June. — *J. acuminatus*, Michx. Fl. (fide J. S. Greene! in Herb. Torr.) Torr. Fl. & Bot. Amer. Cal. Amer. Septent. Michx. — Amer. merid. (Buenos Ayres) Lam. Mey. very positively report our distinct well known Michauxian plant to Lemaire's species on his specimen and — but Lemaire says Kth., does this with an eroteosis — and therefore I'll retain the name of *M.* It is, at least commonly, remarkable for its long capsules calyculum per duplo supererecta; as well as its thick habit of the anthers.

by the strictish habit of the former. Here then I have ventured to do what I at first thought I could not attempt. I have no doubt at all about my specimens - so far as they go - think *J. lamprocaryps* & *pelocarpus* well-marked; but 50 more of each are necessary at least. This will not however be regarded worth while by you; for the first 2 and the last are no doubt right - while the 4th is). *pelocarpus* fide May himself - and the 3d I will be rash enough to "pronounce" identical with the foreign *J. lamprocaryps*. But there are 2 species to be added to the above - and then I believe this view of the northern series will be complete.

J. militaris, Bigel. Fl. Vost. & Auct.
Hab. Map., New Jersey. Greene! Gray! H. Very distinct in its
characters and habit; not requiring particular study here.

7. *J. Conradi*. 85. MSS. culmo erecte gracile prostrato loculo fistulosis, antela terminalia subdecomposita glomerata solitaris sepphi; scariosis acutis capsula oblongo-ovata acuminata-rostrata brevioribus. — *J. viviparus*, Greene MSS!, *J. viviparus*, Conrad in Trans. Acad. Phil! (fide Herb. Torn.) *J. dichotomus*, Torn. herb!, ex specim. non Ell.

Lab. Massachusetts - Green, oaks, such — N.Y.
South Carolina, Greene!
Efflorescent plant with flat leaves + globose fruit can hardly be otherwise
than related to *J. tenuis* — or esp. by May & Witt. It would seem to be the
Southern *J. tenuis* — and specimens agreeing well fr. South Carolina
are in the Greene Herbarium. — This franchises our *Juncus nodosus*. —

I hope I am not too positive in the above, & that you will treat it with consideration. Having the Leanda I have been going thro' it systematically - & had the luck to encounter some American pl. pubd by Schrader in the Index Hart Goeth. 1831 which do not seem to be mentioned in any author at hand. There are 3 species of *Arabis*, from arctic Amer. and a *Trifolium Missouriente*. It is the Leanda for 1833. No. 1. ²⁴ of this ^{was not looking for them} be valuable to you I shall be much pleased. It was quite unexpected. In one of Chas-
ijo's papers I find he recognizes *Alnus viridis* in Kamtschatka - & this with Spach's judgment (if I remember right) & other reasons lead me to doubt if our *A. crispa* is distinct. The 2 sp. cert' look alike. I have asked Oakes to examine & settle it for his W. Mtn. Flora. Then I find Cham. admits *Salix myrtilloides*, as a Boreal Amer. pl - some little confirmation of my reg. of *S. pedicellaris* ^{to that sp.} in Sill. Journ. He also describes 2 or 3 arctic willows without being willing to name them - & one of them I think must be *S. Cutleri*.

many thanks for your precious gift of the famous Banksia - & yet not last for Darleyton and Baldwin. They are invaluable - & the former I should not have expected ever to have. You are resolved that I shall be in your debt: for my two pictures were of little account. I have two heads of Vahl - two of Link - and two of Dr. Porter (I don't know why he sent me 2 - nor why the worthy man ever submitted to the proceps.) I shall be delighted if you find it agreeable to take any of these. There is a head of Waterhouse, the first author on Botany belonging to this Flora of the present cent' - indeed the first after Cutler who wrote in 1785. You have looked at his "Botanist" I suppose. I bought the print in London. My Cambridge "Ennum." has been finished since last winter - & is in Oakes's hands - who said at first ^{that I had nothing to do with Essex - but finally agreed to fix the Essex plants.} Will not it after all be best to go back to your plan & make it a useful manual. The fact was I had an ambition (have had it in view for years - & begun my Catal in 1839.) to be ennum. among those who have ill-
lustrated the Boston Flora. There are one or 2 new notions carried out in the Catal. I always quote the orig' descr. of a species. I will not say *Desmodium viridiflorum*, Beck - but it is "Desmodium viridiflorum (L.) Beck. So in my list of Lichens I have called the Lecidea sorediata of Muhl - a Parmelia - & the modern way would be to put my name alone after - & take the whole credit - but how much better is it "Parm. sorediata (Muhl.) Tuckerman." So far as I know this is original - & the best plan I have seen. No Botanist can make any ^{mistake} without feeling that he ought to have known. Again I mention the year in which every plant became scientifically known by you. Then Josselyn gives a good list "of such plants as have sprung up since the English planted and kept Castle in New England" which gives us the date of most of such plants as dandelion, sheep's purse &c - and these are determinable in all cases by comparison of Parkinson & Smith. Then Josselyn has another list "of such plants as are proper to the country and have no name" where he gives figures, & descr. of *Symplocarpus*! *Gerardia*! *Mulgedium*? *Nabalus*? *Chelone*? *Trillium*? *Sarracenia*? In his other Book he well describes *Oenothera biennis* though under the name of *Hypimachia* which Ray & Monjor called it. Then Cutler a century later 1785 - made known 381 sp. the Fern, Grapes & ledge being excluded: for all which he is cited. Again Cutler (like Joss.) says *Symplocarpus* "must undoubtedly be considered a new genus". His pub. work is not half such a monument to his memory as the ~~copy~~ ms. Flora of which I have seen 3 "books" would be. There *Comandra* & *Microstylis* are scientifically erected into Genera & named. This was in '89. A little work with a sketch of his life extracts from his MSS - to shew what he found out all alone in Ipswich & what he knew with a portrait I sh'd delight to get together: & mean to try to hunt up his other MSS. He was M.D., D.D., LL.D., I believe - a member of Congress - the great Philosopher of the whole country round & minister of Ipswich & Doctor too. On his death-bed he regretted that he had let his time be engrossed so much by Botany! Excuse all errors in the above from yours most sincerely & resp' Edw. Tuckerman

P.S. I have a parcel all ready for Dr. Torrey. Will there be
any way of sending it at present? — May I trouble you yet
further: ~~to~~ I promised a great many botanists in Europe to send
them some plants, and though where I received spec^m, I always gave all
I could — yet almost always the balance was against me. By send-
ing once I think I can finish a good many accounts — which I
shall never get off my mind till I do: and I am willing they should be
in my debt. Then I think how kindly the great Martius, the admi-
rable Zuccarini &c received me — who could bring so little interest
to them — I feel I must satisfy all their expectations. To Sir Wm. Hooker
I must be — want to be, always — in debt to an extent which I cannot
discharge. But parcels for him will be a great while making — for
I mean (if possible) that he shall smile when he turns them over.
I have got at last to feel the extreme importance of complete sets of capi-
tal specimens — ~~with~~ such ~~but~~^{would} be welcome even at West Park, where
common poor Ames' plants are almost coals to Newcastle. What a delight
it is to look at the Specimens of Slope, (too much pressed however) Booth, Oakes, Sartwo-
ell. Such I have now the ambition of making. I mean however not only
that the specimens shall be clean handsome picked ones — like some Maples or oaks,

wch are handsomer than any I have ever seen opp Nature's exhibiting - though this is very well - but that the plants shall shew their metamorphoses - their colours their varieties, &c. Some of the commonest plants will thine lustrouly with this treatment. In this way I am confident of being able to be useful in some degree to Sir Wm. H. - & look forward & have done so with the greatest pleasure - to that parcel - wch shall be made up if I am able to ramble again in woods and fields. My design however is only to satisfy the Europⁿ Botanists who gave me plants - and a parcel added to one of yours would do this. To send my Lichens & everyth^g else whatever to Fries, for this great man has already grasped the whole System of Vegetable Nature - and everyth^g comes to him eloquent as type or deviation - and I think I shall have no competitor in contributing to his store - where everyth^g will tell - my Lichens also to Borrer and Greville - the same to Hooker with all else that I can make worthy - & the same to Dr. Klotzsch - who is another that I shall have to send to all my life - but I am frightened already: & cant think of Mairre of Paris, to whom I owe a good set of Carices - & Montague Lichens. I say if I send the above - & continue to send Fries & Hooker & Klotzsch it will be all I can do. I shall expect nothing back of course except fr. Fries. I promised to get him Schenckin's Syn. Fung. and the Specimen Muscorum. Perhaps the Amer. Phil. Soc. would furnish a copy of the former. Or could I be bought?

But I did not mean to trouble you with all this. I only wished to ask you if you could not conveniently on some occasion let me add a parcel for Prof Zuccarini one for Dr. Hoppe of Carices & perhaps another, to yours, when you send again. If inconvenient it is no matter - but I would rather not send them separately for I cannot continue to send: and these are only ^{to} shew them I am not insensible to their Kindness when I visited them abroad. I am ashamed to send you so much talk; but so it seems to be.



Tuckerman, Edward. 1844. "Tuckerman, Edward Jan. 28, 1844." *Edward Tuckerman letters to Asa Gray*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/225925>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/256408>

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>.