

I have sent you clean sheets as far  
as p. 352 - Proofs are corrected to p.  
480 (in the middle of *Centauria*) 2X to 3  
sheets more will finish. The correcting  
the proofs and checking the references  
is a great labour - I am also printing  
*Flora Australiensis*, vol. VI and a long  
paper on *Compositae* read at the  
Linnean.

25, WILTON PLACE.

Feb 7 11 S.W.

1843

P.S.

My dear Gray

Yours of the 20<sup>th</sup> Jan<sup>r</sup> reaches me  
just as I am sending *Addenda et Corrigenda*  
to the printer. I have inserted the  
substitution of *Bigelovia* for *Chrys.*  
*thamnus*. The part is then *cisteroideum*.  
gives me more trouble than any  
other and I have had to go over them  
several times twisting and turning  
them about without yet arranging  
them to my satisfaction. I had at first  
characterised *Chrys. thamnus* under  
*Linnaea* but was puzzled with a  
Siberian species with ~~a~~ <sup>the</sup> rays  
(when occasionally present) white and  
then studying what Schultz and other  
German have said about the European  
one I felt persuaded they were right

in referring it to a ragless aster  
(*Salatella*) so I struck out the Oldworld  
group and substituted *Chrysanthemum*  
for *Senecio*, leaving the rest as I had  
already written it - and overlooked the  
priority of De Candoles' name.

2. Our specimens of *Senecio* *Rigelowii*  
A. Gr. have not the cuspitate centre of  
the receptacle figured in Bot Whipple.  
We have two good specimens, one from  
Perry the other gathered by Rigelow  
both sent by you. They are concave but  
perhaps not concave if for one has  
the achenes twice as long as the others  
with the same thickness. In both the  
apex of the peduncle bearing the  
involucral bracts is very long and  
when the bracts are off they leave scars  
which might be taken for those of the  
achenes and the whole looks like a long  
or somewhat club-shaped receptacle -  
but (as in *Eupatorium*, *Psidium*, &c.)  
the flowers are only upon the extreme  
summit which is scarcely convex but

in this *Rigelowii* seems slightly plicate  
with the margin of the pappus slightly  
prominent here and there outside the  
flower, not in the centre so that  
either the receptacle figured in Bot  
Whipple or those I examined must have  
been abnormal.

3 *Xanthium* I kept up this genus  
as much on account of the receptacle as  
of the pappus though afterwards in  
drawing up the Conspectus I forgot this  
character - I reduced *Acanthopappus*  
chiefly because you or Torrey have done  
so in *Peck's Eggs* and we have no  
specimen.

4 *Lepidoglossis* looks more like the  
homochromous than the heterochromous  
*Asplenium*, but seems out of place in  
either group - I have not hit upon  
any better affinity.

5 *Hebe*. The only specimens I have  
seen of this plant are Bourgeau's, in  
which I found no pappus. *Epilobium*  
is I believe a different plant - I forget  
just now what I did with it.  
Yours very truly, George Peckham



Bentham, George. 1873. "Bentham, George Feb. 12, [1873]." *George Bentham letters to Asa Gray*

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/226393>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/261180>

**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>.