

(Merckmann)
Celtis rhamnoidea will hardly do for
Acanthoceltis - as there is a C. rham. virens.
- which, although a syn. (probably) of
C. aculeata, ought not to be used for
a n. sp. Did I not state in my

last letter that Planchon's monog. - a
the substance of it, is in the 3rd Vol.
of Walpers' Annal. ? Our plant will
stand next to C. aculeata. It is
better to follow Planchon in considering
the group to which this of it, allies
belong. as only a subgenus. - He, how-
ever regards Momisia Decnot. as a
syn. of Sponia; while Klotzsch (in
Linnaea xx) makes it the same as
Merckmannia H.B.K. Who is to be
followed ?

What is Celtis Texana Scheele (in Linn.)
- with opposite leaves ?

I asked you once for your names of Wright's Erythraea.
Have you determined them ? What do you make of
Grisebach's Californian E. Muhlbergii since you
refer his Penn. plant to E. ramoriprims ? I sometimes
think there is but one Calif. species of this genus.
The stigma varies according to age. Grisebach's
2nd. sections are undistinguishable. Little reliance
can be placed on the length of the flower stalks. ov etc



Torrey, John. 1831. "Torrey, John [undated] [3rd item]." *John Torrey letters*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/310915>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/343027>

Holding Institution

Harvard University Botany Libraries

Sponsored by

Arcadia (Open Collections)

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>.