

I see no hope for Cactaceae
except someone properly qualified
would take it up, and do as
Dr Engelman himself frequently
suggested to me. Study them
de novo "in the spot." The European
collection would be more
confusing than helpful.
Engelman's collection sketches
& notes, would of course be
all important in determining
species. - I should hope that
eventually something might be
done in this direction at
Shaw's garden. which is the best
place, whenever the necessary funds
are available.

We are very comfortable here
I found the confinement & pg at Kew too
much for me yours very
C.C. Parry

No 3. Winsham Terrace
Hfracombe England
Nov 16th 1884

Dear Dr Gray I have not as good
an excuse as you have for
hasty conclusions, being just now
far from a "busy" man, but I
prefer to write off hand where there
is a chance of correction.

There seems to be only a question
of dates to divert us in the
Dict.² Hookeri = (X venulosus) So I
suppose according to rule the
former must stand for the Monterey
bush, but I cannot agree with
you ^{that} Hooker's description in Bot Beech
is done of A. parsonsii, a Don's Bot 2
of A. Hookeri on at all "clear"
being based only on leaf branches
and would apply as well to any
thing else. - But the single specimen
I have seen in Herb Kew. "Beechey" is clear enough.

So then while still insisting
that Nuttalls description is the best
and his name vaucousus the most
appropriate. It must stand only as
a synonym being sustained by
good Nuttallian specimens & by
Hartweg. Gray & Hooker.

I can only say as to the New Hab.
that specimens undistinguishable
are marked in your hand writing
on one sheet. A. Hookeri on another
A. pumila Nutt.

I am equally satisfied from
an examination of Nuttall specimens
of A. pumila in New Hab. &
British Museum. that it is
the same as my Long Mt. specimens
which I only mention out as
"authority" but because I have
seen & studied on the spot. and

made complete specimens. which
agree as far as I can see with
Nuttalls description, and which
you named for me A. Hookeri but
I am however quite inclined to
agree with you that it is var
A. paucous. but if so Nuttalls
A. pumila must go with it.

This is my final say on
this subject. only I hope that
in case you go to Monterey &
San Francisco next Spring as I
hope you may. It may be all
satisfactorily cleared up.

In this same connexion. is there
not a probability that Nuttalls
specimens of A. bicolor marked "Monterey"
should not by some mistake or misplacement
have really come from San Diego. or San Pedro
for no one else has since found it
so far North



Parry, C. C. 1884. "Parry, C. C. Nov. 16, 1884." *Charles Christopher Parry letters to Asa Gray*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/225935>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/254243>

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>.