both appear to have the dipterous calyx forming a distinct genus as in Banksia, and the habit is quite Proteaceous.

I think I must reduce your Hylandra Victoriæ (which is in Australia) to Marlea the apparently chambered anthers are only so in outward appearance as you say in your description and there is a trace of the transverse constrictions in M. begoniifolia - the disk varies in the different species of Marlea (of which we have 2 besides begoniifolia and Victoriæ)

We have all I think been mistaken about Hylocarpa Cav. I think his C. racemosa if not identical with your C. coffeoides at any rate is close to it and with Cupia denseflora DC. Griffithia Gardneri Thw. and your C. Harveyi forms a little group that must go into Randia as I proposed for C. denseflora in Fl. Hongk. Thwaites's Ceylon plant is perhaps specifically identical with R. denseflora - C. racemosa Cav. and C. Harveyi differ slightly but perhaps constantly and may be maintained as species. - Hylocarpa however as understood by W. & Arn. by Thwaites and by myself for C. Webera C. zambaciua (which is in Australia) and other Daveilla-like plants with terminal corymbs may be kept as a genus but cannot retain Cavanilles name. I propose to take up the older one of Webera (which originally applied to C. Webera and which is not wanted even by the most multiplying of modern Rubiaceologists



25, WILTON PLACE,
S.W.

March 8/66

My dear Gray

I sent you the two additional copies you asked for of Part II of Genera with the last part of Linnean Journal In consequence of your last letter to Hooker I think we shall venture in the next box sent from Kew, to put in a few extra copies which we will only charge you when you have disposed of them.

I now write chiefly to ask you if you have anything to say about Australian Compositæ I am about to commence printing the third vol. of my Flora Australiensis It has been very hard work. Eucalyptus alone took me full three months six good hours a day uninterrupted work and all my Acacias required so much boiling to get at their inside that they delayed me much - since that I have got on quicker. I have finished down to Compositæ excepting Rubiaceæ in the

modest of which I am now - and shall have only about 900 species altogether for the volume which I have promised should be an extra thick one and so I shall have to include the whole of Compositae provided they do not exceed 500 or 600 species. The great question I want your opinion about - if you have entered into it - as to the distinction between Eurybia and Aster - and I trust you will not mind my applying to you when after all though I find generally I have to follow you yet I like always to judge for myself. F. Mueller in his last fragmenta acknowledges the identity of Eurybia and Olearia in which I believe he is right - Olearia being the oldest name, but also says there is no difference between them and Aster and therefore renames all the Eurybias as Asters, and for fear of losing the "F. Mueli" if that should not be adopted also publishes them all as Olearias. I always thought there had been a constant difference in the keels and flattened achenes - How does that stand? Have you any other suggestions to make about Australian Compositae - I hope very much to be able to consolidate some of the monotypic or almost monotypic Gnaphaloid genera.

I have recently seen Australian Umbelliferae and Araliaceae - Seemann has made a mess of them - he looks much more at the outside than the inside of flowers - and yet I cannot conceive the principle of putting Aralia in Umbelliferae and Cochlemnus and Hydrocotyle in Hederaceae. In his new part of Flora Vitiensis he enters at length into the reasons he had already given for considering Hydrocotyle as Hederaceous with the essential characters of valvate petals and the only species in his flora is H. Asiatica with very imbricate petals - the fact is he took his characters from H. vulgaris without looking at any other - there are two groups in Hydrocotyle Euhydrocotyle with valvate petals and Centella to which H. Asiatica belongs with imbricate petals. the annuals which Seemann proposes to remove to Trivetopia! have nearly all valvate petals the fact is Hydrocotyle is a very good genus but with scarcely any characters but the stipules, and must remain in Umbelliferae.

I am glad you followed Planch. & Decaisne in putting the Ivies into Aralia - leaving the name of Panax Linn. for his P. fruticosa and others forming Miquel's Nothopanax.

Seemann's distinction between Hedera Australiana & Hedera proper is all bosh except the geminate petiole which cannot be a generic distinction - the genus ruminated embryo is the same in both, and there is no difference in the ovary.

I agree however with Seemann in transferring Astrotricha and Polyscias to Araliaceae as