

- 2254 *Calliandra* sp. I cannot identify
 2259 ——— sp. any of them
 2256 ——— sp.
 1075 *Platolobium lanceolatum* Neeth.
 1373 ——— Duke Mast. var.
 372 ——— *microphyllum* Neeth?
 195 ——— *lancea* Neeth.
 1060 ——— var?
 3713 ——— (*Chloroleuca*) sp.
 -2251 } ——— sp.
 -1073 ——— sp.
 2250 ———
 2257 *Enterolobium cyclocarpum* Griseb.
 367 *Laga semialata* Mast.
 368 } ——— *punctata* Willd?
 369 } ———
 2250 ——— *vera* L.
 366 ——— sp.
 368 ——— sp.
 365 ——— sp.
 2259 ——— sp.
 -2260 ——— sp.

I do not like the way Griseb.
 has treated my genera *Acacia* and
Calliandra. I do not admit *Acacia*
Acacia and certainly *A. tamarindifolia*
 has numerous stamens as figured
 by Jacquin - and as in some of the
 specimens quoted by Griseb. but
 Griseb. has also named in Herb. Bor.
 a species of *Albizzia* near *Albizzia*
 as *Ac. tamarindifolia* and that I know
 is *Acacia* - the *Calliandra*, too have

Recd May 29/61

My dear Gray

I have to thank you for yours
 of the 6th - and perhaps for a previous
 short one since I last wrote - I have
 now been lagging in reading
Casalpinia & *Albizzia* and read
 you my determinations - premising
 that about *Lippia* I made a
 blunder some fruits of *Guaiacum*
arborescens having got mixed - the
 true fruit is *Guaiacum* like in
 look but a real *Leguminosa*
 remarkable from the wing being
 on the valves - not from the
 nature as in *Pterocarpus* - I am
 having the plant figured for the
 next part of Linnean Transactions.
 Kuntze's paper contains

- 341 *Rhopala complicata* H. & A.
 2242 *Guaiacum arborescens* H. & A.
 2243 *Moringa*
 323 *Tephrosia* (same as 2220)
 2232 *Tephrosia*?
 -1072 *Tamarindus indica* L.
 2235 *Parkinsonia aculeata* L.

- 332 *Palatpinia pulcherrima* Lea
 340 *Brownea grandiceps* Jacq.
 2237 — *ravemora* Jacq?
 2247 } *Libidibia coriaria*
 2526 }
 336 *Dauhinia grandiflora* Juss.
 1049 — *the same?*
 335 — (*Paulitia*)?
 330 *Schnella (Caulotrichy) ruvescens?*
 2230 — *S. splendentis* aff.
 337 } — (*Caulotrichy*) sp.
 339 }
 2241 *Cassia fistula* L.
 2233 — *brachyura* Lam.
 2596 — *microphylla* HAR?
 326 — *bacillaris* L.f.?
 1050 } — *C. bacillaris* aff.
 2239 }
 - 1057 — *viminea* L.
 - 1327 — *C. viminea* aff.
 - 331 — *Humboldtiana* DC?
 324 — *occidentalis* L.
 2231 — *C. tomentosa* aff.
 329 } — *semarginata* Simm. (*C. Perab.*
 2234 } *causa* HAR?)
 - 320 } — *indecora* HAR
 2240 }
 330 — *dicapnellaris* L. (*C. indecora* J. Vag.?)
 1050 — *reticulata* Willd.
 337 } — *angustifolia* Lam.
 1052 }
 - 2230 — *var?*
 2236 — *hiemata* L.
 - 325 — *maritima* Willd.
 1056 — *obtusifolia* L. var
 - 1055 — *rotundifolia* Pers.
 2229 — *pilosa* L.
 1054 — *serpens* L. (*prostrata* HAR)
 321 — *nictitans* L.
 - 1053 — *patellaria* DC
 1051 — *var?*

- 319 *Cassia glandulosa* L. var. (*C. flavicoma* HAR)
 320 — — var
 2249 *Eutada polytachya* DC
 - 1074 *Piptadenia peregrina* Deuth.
 361 — — sp.
 1071 — — sp.
 2246 *Protonis dulcis* HAR
 1397 *Dermantus depressus* HAR
 - 349 *Mimosa alba* Kth.
 1059 — *Hortmanni* Deuth.
 343 — *purdia* L.
 359 — *xantholonia* Deuth. (*Acacia cinerea* Willd.
 - 360 — — aff. *id. aculeata*. (see Klotzsch)
 - 1070 — *paniculata* Deuth.
 - 342 — *asperata* L.
 1060 — *exlynonensis* Deuth.
 2244 — — } I cannot at present identify
 1067 — — } any of these
 - 344 — — }
 2245 — — }
 - 370 *Schraudia leptocarpa* DC.
 - 350 *Leucana trechodes* Oth.
 - 340 *Acacia tortuosa* Willd.
 - 362 } — *flexuosa* HAR
 2240 }
 347 — *farneriana* Willd.
 317 — *tamarindifolia* Willd.
 - 349 } — *striata* HAR?
 345 }
 - 233 — *sermentosa* Desv. ex Griseb. - L.
 Westiana DC.
 1351 — *paniculata* Willd.
 2253 *Calliandra Hermannii* Deuth.
 356 — *tetragona* Deuth.
 355 — *portoricensis* Deuth. var
 352 — *foliata* Deuth.
 350 — *sp. n. v. malacophylla* Deuth. var?
 1069 — *Cassini* Deuth.
 353 } — *sp. n. C. xalapensis* Deuth. off.
 - 354 }

deal with his father's labours, lamented
illness and death - he has however been
doing his part of Genes and we
have now between 800 x 900 genera
finished - and have but few large
Malmeiflorous families yet to do.

The two 1st Helena Melthamias
are closely allied (and cognates) of the
Mauritius Trochetia and differ
both in habit and character from
the true African Melthamias -

The 3rd called authors of Argemone and of
some Ruellia are puzzling I should
like to examine them fresh - I have been
looking a good deal into the position of the
stamens in Sterculiaceae altogether - and
to me every thing is against the idea of
any dedoublement in those genera where
they are numerous with and opposite to
the petals - and this has led me within
the last few days to look closely at several
fresh Cruciferae where to me the supposed
dedoublement is also chimerical

Ever your most sincerely
George Bentham

Would you don't neglect Botany
for fighting

May 29 1861
certainly the fruit of a Petioleobium
and not the peculiar Callaandra pod
- so also in P. Saman the fruit becomes
quite thick & succulent and does not
open elastically as in Callaandra

I have done the Ceroophylloea
group for Genes - I restrict Cero-
phyllaea to opposite leaves & capsular
or 1-celled fruit - though the ovary is
sometimes divided when young by
very thin evanescent septiments - Of
course I include Polycarpaea etc which
with Drymorin & other forms a
2nd tribe (Silenaceae & Alueaceae being 1st
second) with the styles united at the base
Paronychia with 1-ovalate ovary and
utricle fruit form I think a small
family much nearer Amarantaceae
Portulacaceae with the 2 sepals & at any
rate fewer than petals form a distinct
family as you propose next Ceroophylloea
Molluginaceae with alternate leaves &
divided capsule must come next to form
a tribe of Phytolacaceae (and some of
these Molluginaceae are true Phytolacaceae)
and Ricoidae including Tetragonium
& Peruviae are again another Calceoliflorae
group - at least I think we shall then
get more natural groups with better characters

I have also finished Malvaceae
and Sterculiaceae - in the former you
have left me little to do - but Bombacae
- must form a tribe of them as Kuntze
& O'Brien proposed - They have all
unilocular anthers - even I should say
Cheiranthemon and Fremontia for I
think the 2 long cells are two distinct
anthers judging by analogy - so
Guarariba goes in Bombacae whilst
Myopodia is true Sterculiaceae - In
Sterculiaceae by a little rearrangement
I think we get definite tribes and
can easily distinguish the whole from
Malvaceae on the one hand and Urticaceae
on the other - Stercorarius for instance
is much nearer Helicteres than
Bombaya - I am now taking up
Hypericaceae and Gallipera the latter
of which seem to be well arranged
by Planchon in the last of the
Bulletin de la Société Botanique

I found some time ago that Gray
on my table a specimen from you of a
Rubiaceae from high up on Pichincha.
J.P. Correll 1895 "Chas. of Monettia"
which you ask me about - It seems to
me to be a true Monettia of the small flowered
set but a new species

Among Crotonaceae plants Black
brought me up two to examine from
among Malameflora which both
are Euphorbiaceous, one is
273 "Magna?" is Garcia nutans
the other 373 "near Myopodia" appears
to be an Alseodora

Subjoined is your account

1860	June Spruce's Saragoto plants conclusion	
	Compositae to the end 1894. —	\$ 3" 1-0
	August Nestlon's Sterculiaceae 18, 19, 20 —	16-6
	Nov Senecian Journal v. 8, 2 copies and 50 of Botany —	2.. 0-0
Dec	do Supplement to v. 5 —	18" 9
1861	April Spruce's Ecuador plants 8044 —	11-13-6
		18" 14" 9
	Deduct balance of last acct —	10-9
		\$ 18" 4" 0

I do not find Nestlon's n. 17 but
will continue to procure it for you

Another supplement to Senecian
Journal will be out in a day or two
containing Oliver's paper on Aurantiaceae
and my notes on Menispermaceae Urticaceae
Rubiaceae & many Daceae - Also a
regular part is I believe just ready
for Hooker has been away a good



Bentham, George. 1861. "Bentham, George May 29, 1861." *George Bentham letters to Asa Gray*

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

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/261143>

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>.