

†
J.M.J.

Hobart. 12.10.75.

My Dear Sir William,

Your former did not as you gloomily suggest "fall into the hands of the lost tribes," but reached its destination in safety. I call you — you know — an occasional correspondent so did not trouble to answer at once and then meanwhile yr second came tumbling in on the heels of the first much to my surprise and pleasure.

I will attend to the orchid commission. I presume it is roots you want or bulbs because I see not the way to send you live plants. If I am wrong let me know.

Did I tell you that for the last 8 weeks I have been in charge of the Bishop's¹ house and the Cathedral and parish while he and his nephew² are away making vacation. This has filled my hands pretty well but I have found some time to do some work too. I am just putting the finishing touches to a complete revision and descriptive critical list of the Tasmanian marine shells.³ It has been a great business and has brought to light some 40 to 50 new species and descriptions of which I am now preparing. Need I say that I will duly forward you all these when they are printed.

¹ Archbishop Daniel Murphy (1815-1907), an Irishman, was ordained priest in 1839 and served in India. Consecrated Bishop in 1845, ill-health forced his resignation and return to Ireland in 1864. He arrived in Hobart in 1866 and was installed as Bishop, (Archbishop 1888). He fought to retain state aid and after its withdrawal built up a system of education. Four of his nephews were priests in Tasmania and he was often accused of nepotism. He acquired a reputation as an astronomer and impressed the 1892 (Hobart) and 1895 (Brisbane) Australasian Science Association Congresses with his papers. (A.D.B., Vol. 5, p. 316.)

² Rev Daniel Xavier Beechinor (1836-1923), a nephew of Bishop Murphy, arrived in Hobart in October, 1866, with five Presentation Sisters (including the Bishop's sister). He served in Richmond (1866-68), Administrator of Hobart Cathedral (1868-1880) and Parish Priest of Launceston (1880-1923). Murphy wanted him (in 1892) to be made co-adjutor bishop but after the priests in Tasmania petitioned Rome, Bishop Patrick Delaney was appointed in 1893 to assist the "nephew-ridden" Archbishop. (Fr. T.J. Linane, Editor "Footprints" private correspondence 14/9/1983, A.D.B., Vol. 3, p. 316.)

³ The "Description of New Tasmanian Shells", *Papers and Proc. R. Soc. Tas.* for 1875, was read on 8th November, 1875, and describes "eighty-two new marine shells occurring in the Tasmanian Seas." Then, on 11th July, 1876, in the paper "On Some New Tasmanian Marine Shells", *Papers and Proc. R. Soc. Tas.* for 1876, a further eighty-three shells were described. "The descriptive, critical list" would seem to be "Census with Brief Descriptions of the Marine Shells of Tasmania and the adjacent Islands". *Papers and Proc. R. Soc. Tas.* for 1877. (Read 13th March, 1877)

The Droseras⁴ are not common here. You have plenty within a short distance of you and I think all our Tasmanian species. What do you want them for? If to show the irritability of the leaf the best species for the purpose is *D. peltata* Smith which you have abundantly. If for the red dye in the root *D. whittakeri* is the one and that grows in open pasture lands near you. For my own part I doubt the irritability of the leaves. I attribute the bending down of the mucous hairs to another cause though I have not read any observations on the subject and only gather these things from what I saw cursorily in the bush.

Don't believe any stories about my settling permanently amongst the Van or indeed any Demons. I shall leave here about Xmas.

You never say anything about Mrs. Archer, Grace or Maggy. I hope they are all well. Will you give them my **love** and most affectionate blessing.

Yrs. most try in the S. Hearts.

Fr. Julian

⁴ The Drosera or sundews are insectivorous plants which have their leaves arranged in the form of a rosette. *D. peltata* shows irritability when it is stimulated but *D. whittakeri* shows little. The bending down of the hairs is due to the stimulus of small insects. Both are tuberous. Woods' information is in the main correct though the red dye in the roots of *D. whittakeri* has not been confirmed (T. Rozga private correspondence, October, 1983). Archer must have been investigating the Drosera for Ferdinand von Mueller writes (13th October, 1875) "The sundew plant sent by you is *Drosera peltata* of Sir James Smith, a species extending widely through Australia and also some parts of India. Like the rest of the species, it has glandular irritability and is poisonous". (Archer Papers, University of Melbourne Archives.)