

Draw of reply to answered letter Nuttall  
Thos. Nuttall New York April 14. 1841. sent April 16.  
Dear Sir

Your letter of the 7<sup>th</sup> inst (post marked 12<sup>th</sup> <sup>which</sup> reached me this evening, somewhat surprised me, and I proceed at once to reply: 1<sup>st</sup> that neither here nor in your former letter do you mention Berlandiera, which I mentioned as the chief thing in which I felt aggrieved, 2<sup>d</sup> that you mention nothing of the names Aster? pilosusifolius &c. which you only could have derived from me. 3<sup>d</sup> ~~that you~~ to see Candolle's plant certainly bears chaff mixed with the flowers as described by de Candolle, and so I told you at Philada, so that you can tell if you choose consider the other spec. as a distinct genus. I have not misled you as to <sup>the</sup> facts, and you can form what conclusions you like. Lab 3 charae. is quite correct except that he does not notice the almost no pappus of the ray. Except in wanting the not chaff I see no difference your C. incana and Lab 3 C. Californica: but it may very probably be a diff. species, as you suggest. Now if you wish to consider ~~your~~ the epaleaceous spec. as a distinct genus, please say so, propose your name and I will make the remark as you shall direct.

Cosmidium was shown to you as a doubtful ~~spec~~ subgenus of Cosmos (not Cosopsis); but either way, who ever took a subgenus of yours, adopted the name, and called it his own genus? How did you know that the Widdens gracilis, Torr. belonged to it? a plant you never saw. - because I told you so! (you have yourself afforded the evidence) I shall now reply seriatim, but very briefly to the Journal

allaying statements of your singular letter. Your Urocarpus, or, Tolmiea, was designated by me as a genus before I saw your Miss. The plant is neither of your discovery nor mine. Why, in publishing a work at our expense, should we vol- untarily yield our genera, formed before we knew of yours, to you, when we describe plants, not collected by you, and which we had before you went to Oregon.

"Pickering & myself assured you that the Umb. ph. & N. Carol. that you had taken to be Pencedanum ternatum was not our plant, but a distinct genus." What then? Do you complain that we did not give you credit for the information? That you have done in full. Had you given the genus a name we should have adopted it as if it were correct, which we have now good reason to believe it is not. If you could not see that your Ligusticum was no Ligusticum, when the necessity that we should stop the printer, then upon our heels, and write to you at Boston to correct your oversight. Would you have done it? Credat Judex Appell!

Your allusion to Sayophytum is unfortunate. We have not transformed your Trichomeria from a section of Ranunculus to one of Sayophytum, as you erroneously state; but your plants





Gray, Asa. 1841. "Gray, Asa Apr. 14, 1841 [Gray to T. Nuttall]." *Asa Gray correspondence*

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/224661>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/251856>

**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>.