

# California Academy of Sciences.

Post Office Box No. 2247.

San Francisco, July 20, 1885

Dear Dr. Gray:-

Your Chied Mimulus, just in, you seem inclined to reckon in with M. mordorum: but all that sort of thing, and we have plenty of it collected long ago by Blandin. I have put into M. moniliformis, as you can see: for I have referred to Blandin's specimens, which you had named for him "M. mosastrum". The moniliform rootstocks you would probably have found later in the season. At least, I have always found them forming as the plants were going at flowering, in August & Sept. They may perish, for aught I know, with the growth of the young plants in Spring. The strong apical plication of the corolla tube or throat, and the decided elongation of the end, marks M. moniliformis as distinct from M. mordorum, whose end lacks nothing but the flattening of its ends to bear it perfectly globular. As for the musky sent that, I am now convinced, I have made too much of. It is found, Mr. Lyon assures me, in M. mordorum down his way. I am confidus - I too have been aware of its presence in good M. moniliformis: and I am very certain that the more willow-

forms of even M. jinuuloides are strongly musty.  
I noticed it so both in Scott Mts. & in the Sierra years  
ago. We must set our friends to find out  
if the big M. irodous does, late in autumn develop  
the moniliform rootstock. I do not think it.  
nor expect it. But if the species is to be reduced  
then is when it must go, or not - into M. moniliformis.  
Surely we are obliged to drop the odor character, but  
those of the corolla and seed are, I think, good for  
the maintenance of both M. moniliformis & M. irodous.  
What I have reckoned as blushing & the latter is never  
according to my knowledge, a small plant. It will  
average two feet high.

I have probably written you enough already regarding  
Eunanus; but I enclose a few seeds of E. Bolanderi & E. Crispus.  
Under a good strong lens you will find them unincultate;  
& many other species of Eunanus proper, show a  
leaving this way; & so does E. (Minulestrum) pictus.  
The oily viscosity, and the sickening odor of green tobacco, strong  
in several species, and traceable in every one of the species  
of proper Eunanus and E. Minulestrum, Bentham & Hooker  
knew nothing about. Probably Mr. Bentham  
if some handfuls of these plants, <sup>fresh</sup> had been brought to  
him with his eyes bound, would have said: they  
were solanaceous but for their opposite leaves.  
This would escape the knowledge of the most close-tottiest,

but when once known it must be taken into account. I did not make my move audaciously, to show how I could dare set forth an opinion differing from that of the ablest botanists of the century, nor even with the thought that, in future generations, some authorities might take my view. I think no botanist who knows these plants familiarly as we know them after so many years have lived among them, will approve of their reduction to Mimulus.

It really looks to me like a subversion of all rules for the systematizing of Gamopetalum & put under one generic name such corollas of those of Eruca Esculenta, E. Mohrensis, & Mimulus ringens. Surely Bentham could not have done it knowing what he was doing, as you and I know.

It is probably because I have been, for the most part, a field student, and have had ten or a dozen years of almost weekly detecting the errors & learned men of the herbarium and library, that - I dissent strongly from your view that Bentl. & Hook. should have influence with you, as they do have, in this case. But you have their material before you. You can tell if they had means of knowing even the fruit characters of a considerable number of species of Eruca, which I doubt.

# California Academy of Sciences.

Post Office Box No. 2247.

San Francisco,

188

In Mimulus I fear there are some errors of mine to be corrected. M. guttatus must take in those annual forms which I ought to restore under M. microphyllus, Benth., & also my M. nasutus; for in the south part of the state I found plenty of those peculiar calyxes on plants which had not the winged stem nor the small corollas & those well marked specimens on which I thought a species would be well founded. Nevertheless, at All Saints' Bay I obtained what was just like M. nasutus in its best shape. The species, <sup>M. guttatus,</sup> is a whole, almost annual. Taken as a whole thin on my few plants which propagate themselves from one season to another by noting basal joints. I am not sure that I have detected it in but one instance. I will send you soon specimens by & by.

Diplacus stellatus has foliage of a quite different texture from that of D. glutinosus. It must be distinct. Its corollas are only half as large; nor can I see that pubescence on any

main-land form.

\*D. pallidus you must not confound with D. longiflorus. The pubescence is very unlike, and the corolla is of quite another cut.

The plant you left on my table as "D. latifolius" is only what I should call the ordinary D. glutinosus. D. latifolius comes from the Sierras, (or foot-hills of them) and has also its own characteristic corolla.

There is one more point, in Diplacus.

D. pumicens flowers four months earlier than does D. glutinosus, and yet there is not a week's difference between the flowering of the same species of plants, in San Diego, & San Francisco.

True, both species of Diplacus scatter a few flowers through the whole year, but each has its 6 or 8 weeks of purple blooming. It is March - April with the southern one & July + August with the northern. The trees + shrubs growing with the Diplaci in both counties (as for ex Laurus agnifolia) put forth their leaves in March, and a week or two earlier (!!!) in S. G. than down yonder. But I think you admitted the genuineness of pumicens as a species.

I wonder if it is your purpose to put forth the new issue of the Syn. Fl. before winter.

Some Diplaci are scrubby.

J. A. S.

\*

# California Academy of Sciences.

Post Office Box No. 2247.

San Francisco,

188

And, if the newest vol. is also to be revised and amended. I hope not yet. New things are coming in too fast. Our alterations are perpetually suggesting themselves. I have already in manuscript one thing which I must tell you of. My Ms. is the result of a settled conviction which I have been coming to for several years, that - your S. Kuhniaeoides of Carpophyllum is a good genus of Helianthidea. My late trip along the peninsula gave me the means of settling that question beyond a doubt in my own mind. You would not believe me when I told you five years ago that the flowers were yellow; and I see you have rejected the testimony of every body down to the same fact; you could allow them to be "ochreous" because that would admit them when Mr. Bentham placed them, in Eupatoriaceae: but evidently neither he, nor you after him, nor carefully noted the akenes, which are such as can not be admitted in Eupatoriaceae. Perhaps you never had them mature. I will send you some, in my cedar box, that are so, and you will see that they

4.

slip neatly into Helianthideæ, where the deep yellow flowers, and the rough, sun-flower-smelling herbage suggests that the species may belong, in spite of the Johnson arms of the Jappus, a thing which is not new in that tribe.

I have named the genus Bebbia, but I have not yet told Bebb.

What will you think of this?

I have lots of our composita in M.S. and you will not blame me for preferring to print them myself first, rather than have them go out in your book as "from in herb.", if there is time for me to do so.

The final query is: Will you ever make your way through this very long epistle?

Very Truly Yours

E. L. Greene.



BHL

# Biodiversity Heritage Library

Greene, Edward Lee. 1885. "Greene, Edward L. July 20, 1885." *Edward Lee Greene letters to Asa Gray*

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/225942>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/256112>

**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>.