

Boscaur Ap 14th 1866

Dear Dr.

In Grisebach's list or 1865 collection No 360 *Balania spinosa* Rink
strange that tho' I have Richards figure stereotyped on the brain I have
never been able to recognise the plant. To compare your specimen with Rink's
figure and ^{your opinion and} tell me what is Grisebach's last opus about the matter. You have
his account of it I part.

I am picking up flaws in his Cat. I find under *Pavonia subundulata*
"corolla (sicca rosea)" & under *P. cordifolia* "petalis (sicis roseis -)" and under
P. megaphylla "petalis rubris". Now so well as I remember I haven't
seen a purple-flowered *Pavonia* in Cuba. How comes it then that Gris.
describes the color of the flowers from the dried specimens & not from
the labels? Did Dr. Gray pocket the labels & leave Gris. to describe by guess?
Now this is not treating me right. My reputation for accuracy is at
stake. I wish you to do me the justice to examine into this. I don't
ask it as a favor as I do many other things. Grisebach seems
to quote much of Rink's special habitats than he does mine
as if he had not the tickets contenting himself with "Cub. or." or
"Cub. or." only; and these often wrongly put (I don't allude to the earlier numbers
of those the tickets were lost.)

I can't account for the mania of being over particular. After
leaving friend Blain in Havana where he goes as ^{once in two years maybe} seldom as possible,
he has now put Dr. Morales there also. If he had been content
to say "botanici cubensis" it would have been amply sufficient and
all right. I must say these blunders annoy me for the people
here will probably attribute them to my carelessness.

When you get a complete copy (surplus) of the "Cat. pl. Cub." won't
you have it bound, interleaved, for me & send it when you have
anything else so as to make up a package?

I am sorry that Grisebach does not give the derivation
of his new generic names. It would be convenient to such as
I who doesn't carry a Greek Lexicon in his cabera. It sometimes
helps a fellow out of an uncertainty.

I wrote you once that I had made out a list of all the numbers and in a column headed "Lauvalle" I have checked off all the numbers he has received. Mr. Gay promised me his numbers & shall probably get them also from Mr. Grisebach & Mr. Fritsch. By this means we will be able to distribute them only such plants as they have not already received. I would be glad to get a similar list from all the other subscribers so as to give them no more duplicates and one cause for growing. Is the scheme practicable to any extent? And can you help to accomplish it?

1972. I am growing wrathful and as I can not blow up Lysimachia lookout, you, for squalls. I was at San Marcos yesterday and got *Cacalia discolor* Gr. Why in the name of common sense does he trust to Tom, Dick & Harry whose testimony as to the color of flowers came through Bill, Ted. & Gussie culminating in Richard in whom he seems to have the blindest of blind faith - instead of following my trustworthy notes (generally) I am satisfied that my ticket (if you sent it) had on it "fl. white" as they are. Such blindness sets me. I wish he had quoted my special habitats as he does Regel's. There are two errors in the character of the above plant - leaves 3¹/₂-4" long, 8"-10" later & "squaminate". In San Marcos I got also *Phidisia fimbriata* fls. and a *Pteris* new to my collections. I had often before seen the bush & wondered what it could be but I was always too late for its commonness with the others (or several of the) ~~other~~ species it flowers almost contemporaneously with the appearance of the leaves & the fr. maturing rapidly all ^{young} ~~of~~ fruiting leaves soon disappears. I got also a good supply of *Daphne ceylanica* from the only plant yet known to me. Also some *Plumeria* *sericea* & *tinctoria* and various *Mystaceae*. *Otegnosia utusa* plenty of fl. *Sachiekia tricaphala*. *Spicellum radiopagnum* - a capital name, if it means "that you can't pull up the plant by the stem" or that the roots break if you try.

Malacca. "34." (Unknown) "No sirree, I know'som. That is, unless I am woefully deceived. But the character given in Grisebach is horrid. He fl. are not on a spadix as I understand it no more than a lily is unless that the fl. being within a ligule separate the peduncle below it is necessarily a spadix. However, that don't matter. The leaves are not opposite as we understand it on law. Imagine a plant with equitant leaves ^(changes grow and are seated round the stem with it.) flattened in just the contrary direction and you will have a pretty good idea how the plant is. It is an 2-3 not "central" as described by Grisebach but lateral. The L. I have examined but slightly, ^{commonly of us always written} wishing to destroy them unnecessarily & not knowing how many I had. But I answered this much that it has 14 linear ^{4-5"} *Strophias* (or styles?) and but few ~~anthers~~ ^{4-5"} anthers. Will you have it figured? I will pay for it. I got also what may be a *Najas* - ^{plenty of fl.} but not s. Anthers 2 on a consolidated filament one near the axis lower down & shorter the opposite extending beyond the connective & deeply notched. Both sagittate-lanceolate. It isn't *N. major* for the leaves are narrowly lanceolate entire. Stamens at length exceed one inch long or more.

Please do me the favor to look at the above-named species of *Parvinia* and *Leucalnia discolor* to be sure that you did not keep the tickets for I don't want to give Grisebach a blessing unless he merits it as I feel much in the humor, just now, to do.

In San Marcos I got a quantity of the bark from a *Teargasera*? or whatever it may turn out to be I suppose you can determine from the locality or in some way having Grisebach's determination of the family. You see it resembles very closely the bark of *Lagella* & of *Zizyphus* (lost two knives & a pencil - campus out in the pine woods).

Oh dear I do miss so much those missing sheets. They contain too the families I so want to study when so many of the puzzle are Daphnebs. Legum. Myrt. Melastom. Formich. &c.

Enclosed are a couple of scraps for Grisebach. I hope you don't throw these notes into the basket under the table.

2nd of the little plant supposed to be *Najas* I have now the and it

is not *Najas* (fid descr.). It has two ovaries one sessile the other on a short stalk each with a long filiform style. The seed is dark green with the remains of the style about the middle of one side. What is it?

Basta for this time. Kind regards to Mrs Gray - and to Mrs Davis?

Yours ever Charles Wright



Prof. Asa Gray,
Cambridge,
Mass.



Wright, Charles. 1866. "Wright, Charles Apr. 14, 1866." *Charles Wright correspondence with Asa Gray*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/257972>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/277056>

Holding Institution

Harvard University Botany Libraries

Sponsored by

Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Public domain. The BHL considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection.

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>.