

other tuft I took an unripe capsule
which is represented within the largest capsule
and is another species with ^{branch} longer leaves twisted
when dry - ~~had~~

91 Bryum binum

- 85 Barbula latifolia which Austin had labelled Barbula oblongifolia etc.

I have examined the following plants which
are sent some time ago - and find

- 324 Scorpium fasciculatum Scop. Oliv & congestum

- No 38839 Lor. fasciculatus - same although it var.
ries in trifling points yet I make nothing else

- Bartramia calcarea - when I first

looked into this plant I thought differed much in
several points and therefore determined to sketch it - but when drawing the characters found it was
not so various - I however send sketch for your eye
a plant of natural size from which all are drawn on post paper
see sketch - I got off the most mature capsule but
all under $\frac{1}{2}$ " in diameter - I give all the 6 pinchate
leaves which are long ovate long acuminate
stratified upwards & the others are from below the stems
(innovations) downward not veryulate -
on the back or other side of lip are 7 leaves lower
range of abuton (innovation) and above a male plant
with nine perigonial leaves - you note the form
the nerve vanishes below the apex

continuation of last p 1882

and cannot recall any characters as of any
sketch sent before me I cannot say so I have
taken off the balance of my mounted specimen to
I had at the last sketch taken off a portion as I
could not find an unmounted plant (I had when I
received the plants from Mr. Bidderome divided
the stock and marked one for you and ~~so~~ I can
not find & conclude I must have sent it to
you -

I find this species is bisexual and some of the
leaves are chlorophyllous as seen in the first leaf
I was not aware that it was intermediate between
B. Warrenii & B. lacustris - I submit these 3
additional leaves for your decision on this point
as I do not know by a certainty which of the spec
imens which I have sketched from time to time are the
true B. Warrenii I am not upon the names you admit
B. Warrenii & B. lacustris as I have ~~seen~~ so I cannot
make comparative sketches of them

- Bryum Blindei I have placed the leaves of a
specimen from Ontario with Austin's Southport
Eng plant, and have compared them side by side &
I have concluded that our plant is B. Blindei -
by form of leaf and articulation it is distinct

- Mnium subglobosum I did think our

252 a distinct species from the shortness of the nerve
the articulation and the margin of a single row of
cells - but now consider it a young form of
Mn. subglobosum - an error occurs in drawing
in which I have detected - No 253 had the Mn.
punctatum major and 254 had the Mn. puncta
tum I had not looked in 254 and so I sent

a specimen from 253 thus the mistake
in sending *Mn. punctatum* - I have now
examined both and find the name
of the 253 distinct ^{and no doubt the one}
~~but~~ not so fully
apte to Edmundo's description - so you have
it described - the 273 whence ~~was~~ ^{the one}
which I sketched in in that No. by mistake
for 253 was to have only *C. circinatum* type

If you have the least doubt of *Mnium*
pumilophyllum please omit it altogether

Cambridge Jan 12 1882.

My dear Mr. Lesquereux -

I found only one novelty among
the dozen & half of Iowa mosses from Dr. Archer
which I submit the sketch & specimens to you

- *Hypnum* ^{all India usual} Charles City Iowa
see sketch ^{high tower} & C. C. 1875.
The capsule is peculiar slightly curved open
culm large apiculus not prominent - peristome
of the genus anomalous large compact & coniform
peristome ^{longitudinal} leaves - large thin texture the
nerve not thick strong vanishing below apex
the somewhat transverse apes obliquely serrate
see the 3 leaves drawn into the capsules - This stem
leaves ovate acute acuminate nerveed midway
not concave entire & branch leaves falcate con-
cave nerveed half way - monicous the gemmae
minute - Please report the species

Among the dozen mounted plants of Prof Macoun
were *Bryum uliginosum* - *Hypnum* - *Hyp-*

acutum which was labelled by Austin
Step. Austinii Sullivan I was not aware
that Sullivan had named a *Brachythecium*
austini before was it published by him -

83 *Pissidium ventricosum* which was labelled
Piss. Hallianum Ferguson ¹⁸⁷¹ (a Scotch botanist)
but your name has priority Dec 1867 - *Pri-*
chotomum anomalam Warren - *Pri-*
chotomum scitulum a plant so named by Austin
was published in Bot. Gazette v. 2. p. 29 - it
was described very meagrely from a barren
plant see his diagnosis our plant differs
it was labelled by Prof Macoun - whether
it had been seen by Austin is not stated

84 *Pri-chotomum scitulum* Athanasius
plains Sept 20 1872 Macoun -
see sketch etc - the plant is small and is as much
to a *Pri-chotomum* as to a *Dicranium* the leaves do not
stand out from the plant as that species - the cap-
sule is like to a ^{small} *Pri-chotomum* simple the peristome
is rather quadrangular obtuse - leaves are broad
or subtrigonal at base attenuated and hardly
serrated at the point papillose on the back the
few perichalial longer sheathing - male organs
near the midrib anthers long slender with paraphys
on basal articulation the upper articulation obscure

I do not find a resemblance in my figures -
Austin published *Pri-chotomum scitulum* in
the Bot. Gazette v. 29 from a barren stem of New Jersey
plants a meagre description which see -

This specimen was labelled by Prof Macoun and
whether Austin had seen it I do not know -

88 - *Bryum capitatum* - 89 *Wibergia* - not
in fruit - not determined - 90 *Bryum sub-*
rotundum 24 coll J. Fowler New Brunswick 1871
This plant I have sketched see it - as

90 *Bryum capillare* It is very small and grew in ^{wholly in sand}
dry ^{sparsely} some branches had anthers only - ^{had}
not got a good peristome capsule were too immature to
the shape of the 3 capsules and the leaves seem to be *Bry-*
gibbum ^{gibbum} - There were two small drifts from the

Cambridge Jan'y 28th 1882

My dear Mr. Le Sueur

Yours of 23rd is received the ~~morning~~
of 23 Bartonia.... Vancouver's Island ~~Marchica~~
is an usual small plant and might have
its name from the reason it is surely a new species
you may name - It will not do to name it for
Prof. Macoun as Austin has named a B. prae-
formis for him and published it - It would lead
to confusion to make B. Macounii, we can com-
plement him with naming some other genus -
~~the plant was sent to me by Prof. Macoun~~

You have described B. Muhlenbergii which
I consider right - Do you introduce B. Marchica?
I sketched ~~Bartonia~~ ^{down} & sent to you were any of
them B. marchica? -

59. Bobera or Bartonia - Royston Park Owen
I have haurily sketched 2 leaves of this - To my eye the
anulation is not that of a Bartonia - But as it is to
be omitted nothing more of it -

Bartonia Mohrenia C. Mull. Have you admit-
ted this sp. into the manual? I sent a sketch of it some
time ago

59. Physcomitrium pyriforme? Colorado Drawn.
The aspect of this seemed different from pyriforme that I
have sketched it - The capsule is unusually long &
narrow too, operculum more prominent still it may
be only a var. of pyriforme

I have been going thro' Prof. Macoun's last consignments
but not finished I took up ^{all} the Bryophytes & Moths
and have found the following that I do not
quite know the species - viz.

Cambridge Jan'y 1882

My dear Mr. Le Sueur, D.Sc.

I have been up to the Herbarium this
morning and find the following remarks
on a packed herbarium - viz:

1. Bartonia Marchica (?)
(= B. Muhlenbergii) Ohio
" Sept 1853 - compared the within critically
with authentic specimens of Bart. Marchica,
(Eichh. Schimp.) cannot see wherein they differ
from that species - male & female in all details
compared -
" These specimens are doubtless B. Muhlenbergii Schimp.
Within our state ~~there~~ ^{are} male plants of no
" of B. marchica ^{there} by Muhlenbergii &
and two sketches one " Marchica
" B. marchica = Muhlenbergii Ad. 1855
& the other "Bart. Muhlenbergii - Marchica" 1855
These two sketches represent leaves -
which appear simply somewhat broader
In Schwaegeleken sup. 1. sec II. p. 58 is his descrip-
tion of Bartonia Muhlenbergii ^{simply no rev-} ~~compl.~~
arts by Sullivan ¹⁸⁵¹ ~~only his~~ ¹⁸⁵¹ ~~1850~~ ¹⁸⁵⁰ ^{B. Muhlenbergii}
& find in C. Mull. 1851 - a closely similar descrip-

So Sullivan in 1856 has determined B. Muh-
lenbergii to be identically B. marchica -

No 59 Bartonia - Royston Park - We have
no fruiting Specimens - noticing the male
plant to be prominent - I sketched the male plant
and all the perigonial leaves, on the back of slip
of my former sketch which surely do not resemble
those of B. Marchica in Eng. Eur. - - - -
So I dismiss all B. Muhlenbergii considering
them all B. marchica

— 73 Bartsiamia Vaccinium st. mucronata
It is a very delicate minute plant and it is
divous & in char differs from B. radicans but
more in its other characters. Its stem leaves are
oval (narrowed at the base) long acuminate rather
strongly serrate - areolation more quadrate
by papillæ - the perichaetal lanceolate quite
long acuminate striate or plicate more sharp
by serrate - stem leaves somewhat broad
acute & extending to a long slender point.
branch leaves smaller and some peltate
male gemma with large outer pungent
leaves quite broad at the concave base and
acuminate to the point - curve not
strong vanishing below the apex ^{the} more
inner leaves broadly ovate acute more ob-
tuse nerve shorter
Is more like B. marchica than B. radicans

If you think these variations do not amount
to enough to separate it from B. marchica
it might be a variety signifying small
cory remarks by Sullivan on this in Herbarium
showing B. radicans to be B. longiseta — — —

— 74 Bartsiamia radicans Bucks Co Porter is
right! I accidentally found the male organ in
envelope by the side of the female

19th — I have been looking over a number of my na-
tive & foreign Bartsiamas to day & taking up —
— 75. Bartsiamia — New England see sketch
It may be B. marchica = B. Mahlbergiae the
pungent leaves have a decurrent form and quite
broad at base — what do you consider it?

— I have sketched the pungent leaves of a
B. marchica from a foreign specimen to
show the actual of an authentic B. march-
— ca for comparison it is drawn in the high
power — I send it —

— 73 Bartsiamia I took this up
again & I have sketched on a small slip
the pungent leaves of another male
gemma — You still will observe the large
broad concave obtusely acuminate form
nerve vanishing towards the base and
ending quite below the apex of three of the
leaves, and the very broad, base and rather
abruptly sharp acuminate point and
nerved strongly of others on the back of the
slip I send the old & the last = three, as
I consider it sp. nov —

— 75 Ulbera — not a Bartsiamia I took
this up again to day — I find the areolation
is that of a Bryum (Ulbera) it is by no
means a Bartsiamia areolation — I had
two days ago sketched on the back of the old
slip a male plant & the leaves of it but had
not noticed the areolation — At any rate
there are no fruiting plants and nothing
can be made of it — I return it that you may
see it —



James, Thomas Potts. 1882. "James, Thomas P. Jan. 1882 [to C. L. Lesquereux]." *Thomas Potts James letters to Asa Gray*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/225937>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/257515>

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>.