This article was downloaded by: [University of Cambridge]
On: 24 January 2015, At: 05:48
Publisher: Taylor & Francis
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:
1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street,
London W1T 3JH, UK

Transactions of the Botanical Society of Edinburgh

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tped18>

II. Notice of Abnormality in Flowers of Lilium

J. Christian Esq.

Published online: 01 Dec 2010.

To cite this article: J. Christian Esq. (1860) II. Notice of Abnormality in Flowers of Lilium, Transactions of the Botanical Society of Edinburgh, 6:1-4, 6-7, DOI: [10.1080/03746606009467673](https://doi.org/10.1080/03746606009467673)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03746606009467673>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Nichol, who states that, "besides including some species of universal occurrence, as *Sphagnum cymbifolium*, *Mnium punctatum*, *Jungermannia albicans*, *Tamarisci*, and *epiphylla*, they also comprise some of the rarer species, as follows:—*Dicranum majus*, *Campylopus longipilus*, *Zygodon Mongeotii*, *Orthotrichum Bruchii*, *Bartramia arcuata*, *Pogonatum alpinum*, *Plagiothecium elegans*, *Eurhynchium praelongum*, *E. pumilum*, *Jungermannia compressa*, and *Scapania nemorosa*. *Plagiothecium elegans* is a species of rare occurrence in this country, although widely distributed. It, as well as *Eurhynchium pumilum*, has probably been overlooked. The rest of the species here enumerated are all of a subalpine type."

The following is a list of some of the lichens collected, as drawn up by Mr Sadler:—" *Lepraria alba*, *Lecidea icmadophila*, *L. geographica* var. *sulphurea*, *Parmelia caperata*, *P. perlata*, *P. saxatilis*, *P. physodes*, *P. herbacea*, *P. parietina*, *Sticta pulmonaria*, *Peltidea canina*, *P. horizontalis*, *P. polydactyla*, *Nephroma resupinatum*, *Cetraria glauca*, *Ramalina scopulorum*, *Sphaerophoron coralloides*, *Cladonia uncialis*, *C. rangiferina*, *C. furcata*, *Scyphophorus cervicornis*, *S. pyxidatus*, *S. bellidiflorus*, *S. digitatus*."

Specimens of the plants were exhibited to illustrate the paper.

II. Notice of Abnormality in Flowers of *Lilium*. By J. CHRISTIAN, Esq. Communicated by WILLIAM BRAND, Esq.

This communication by Mr Christian was accompanied by several interesting specimens, which were laid before the meeting. They had been examined by Dr George Lawson, who reports as follows:—"In the lily sent by Mr Christian there are ten sepals, eleven stamens, and two ovaries; the petiole is slightly flattened, and appears to be formed of two petioles united. I think the monstrous flower is undoubtedly formed, not by the growth of additional parts, nor by chorisis, or the splitting of organs during their development, but by the fusion of two flowers into one. According to this view the number of parts should be as follows:—*Sepals*, twelve; *stamens*, twelve; *ovaries*, two. In the specimen, two of the sepals seem to be lost by adhesion, as is indicated

by two of them presenting a slight cleft towards the apex, showing apparently that they are double. Add this number, two, to the number actually in the flower, ten, and we have the proper number, twelve. Mr Christian states that there were eleven stamens (of which only eight now remain in the flower). I am unable to account for the missing stamen further than to suppose it may be due to adhesion or abortion."

III. *Short Notice of a Peculiar Form of Fungus.*

By JAMES YOUNG, M.D.

The fungus which was exhibited had been found by Dr Young while assisting Mr Edwards in the operation of excision of the knee-joint. The patient was, after the operation, laid on a new and clean bed, with a hair mattress, which had been previously covered with gutta percha sheeting, and the limb supported by a M'Intyre splint. The patient lay in considerable comfort for some days. The bed, however, became very soon damp, and it was found necessary to have him changed. On the fourteenth day after the operation, he was removed from the bed to a sofa till the mattress was changed and a new one substituted, when attention was directed to an extraordinary appearance on the under part of the bed, where the fungus was produced in large quantity, growing equally from the spar as from the mattress. The bed was thoroughly cleaned, but in spite of this, at the expiry of nine or ten days, the same appearance was again presented, the fungus being nearly in equal quantity as before.

IV. *Remarks on the Fungus.* By the Rev. M. J. BERKELEY.
Communicated by Professor BALFOUR.

"The fungus is an imperfect state of some *Coprinus*. A similar case is reported in some Italian Transactions, and I recollect one which occurred at St George's Hospital in 1825, and the occurrence was much commented upon at the inquest. The Hospital authorities, on the inquest, chose to deny the fact, but I recollect seeing the case in the Hos-