

I will return your Mss. of *M. Xanthus*.
on Monday. This, I suppose, is early
enough.

I am really glad to hear that Jane
is bearing up so well in the severe
work of housecleaning. Give her much
love - from yours faithfully
J. Torrey

New York, June 3rd, 1859

Dear Doctor -

I did not know, until your
bundle was fully opened at home, that
it contained a letter of a list of *Xanthus*;
plants. The money that I owe
you shall be left at Weberman's but
I could have sent it to you in a letter.
(bills & stamps) -

I have looked over the list, & compared
it with the specimens. There a few
points on which I differ from you, which
I will note.

Chorizanthe (*Mucrona*) *perfoliata* is
the same as *Muc. Californica* of Mss. Bonpl.
Bentham examined specimens of the plant
(from Parry's coll.) - & pronounced it *M. Calif.*
- notwithstanding the greater number of teeth
in the involucre. He had those specimens
before him when he prepared the monog. for DC. Prodr.
- for he says, in the ~~description~~ *generic*
charact. invol. varies 3-4-dentatum. & quotes
Parry's plant. [You say in your sp. char.

"glabella" - when the specimens sent to me
are obviously pubescent. The fig. of Benth
shows the leaves ("bracts") to be connate - & yet,
in the text (Roth.) he asks if they are connate -
- Oh - I see, too, he calls them shell-like - 3-lobed.
I have no Douglasian or other specimens
of the plant (except a young one from Fremont)
for comparison.

Your *Asclepias verticillata* is no *Asclepias*
at all, but *Acerates tomentosa*, Mex. B. Rep.
& quite different from Whipple's plant.

Pentstemon tenuifolius is described in
the Mex. B. Rep. p. 115, under the name that
I had long called it in my herbarium. I
inserted a brief diagnosis in your Rep.
- because I found the species had been in-
-advertently omitted. You must have seen
it when you corrected the proofs - but
had forgotten the circumstance -
Your name is better

You have an *Eritrichium* which is new
to me - & another that I received in
Newberry's (Dec. 24th) collection - which
like yours, is too young for description - but
quite different from any other in my herbar.

Your account of *Neoviscia* pleased me
greatly - & the specimens of the plant
were most acceptable. The genus
is very close to *Spiraea*. Some species of
which, have also, evident albumen in
the seeds: & so has *Gillenia*. I send
(fearing you may not have them in
perfection) seeds of *Spiraea spulifolia*
for examination -

Have you ever noticed singular folding
of the cotyledons in *Rutallia* - a kind of
absolute vernation! as in the sketch - 
I have seen nothing like it in any other
Doracaea

Some time ago I was examining the rhizome
of *Anemopsis*. The structure is not unlike
that of *Croton*, as far as I made it out.
I send you a bit of it



Torrey, John. 1859. "Torrey, John Jun. 3, 1859." *John Torrey letters* –.

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

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/343327>

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>.