This article was downloaded by: [University of Arizona]

On: 19 April 2015, At: 07:51

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:
1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street,
London W1T 3JH, UK

Transactions of the Botanical Society of Edinburgh

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tped18>

II. On some British Cyperaceæ recently discussed by Dr Carrington

Charles C. Babington M.A. ^a

^a Cambridge

Published online: 01 Dec 2010.

To cite this article: Charles C. Babington M.A. (1863) II. On some British Cyperaceæ recently discussed by Dr Carrington , Transactions of the Botanical Society of Edinburgh, 7:1-4, 458-460, DOI: [10.1080/03746606309467882](https://doi.org/10.1080/03746606309467882)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03746606309467882>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

and capsule. 7. Archegonia surrounded by the inner involucreal scale. 8. Part of the apex of a leaf, showing the crenate margin and form of the cells ($\times 300$). 9. Anther. 10. Spores and bi-spiral filaments; these are badly figured.

Fig. vi. *Alicularia scalaris*.

Areolæ of the leaf ($\times 300$) as seen in the living plant; the cells containing chlorophyll granules, and peculiar jointed nuclei. From a drawing of Dr Gottsche.

PLATE XI., Figs. i.-viii.

Fig. i. *Jung. obovata*, Nees.

1. Plant not magnified. 2. Upper part of fertile stem, showing the adnate perianth and capsule. 3. Stem with ♂ spikelet. 4. Stem leaves. 5. Areolæ.

Fig. ii. *J. catenulata*, Hüben.

1. Stems natural size. 2. Fertile stem and perichætium. 3. Apex of gemmiferous stem. 4. Leaf treated with Liq. potassæ. 5. One of the segments showing the punctate areolæ ($\times 300$). 6. Perichætial leaf, the segments entire, and amphigastrium. 7. Calyptra and capsule. 8a. Decurrent leaf of *J. connivens*, giving the stem a winged appearance. 8b. Large convex areolæ ($\times 300$).

Fig. iii. *Plag. punctata*, Tayl.

1. Stem leaf. 2. Cells prepared with zinc. biniod. ($\times 300$).

Fig. iv. *J. curvifolia*, Dicks.

1. Stem leaves, ventral aspect. 2-4. Leaves ($\times 120$). 6. Apex of leaf and areolæ.

Fig. v. *Plag. tridenticulata*, Tayl.

1. Upper portion of ♂ stem ($\times 20$). 2. Amphigastria. 3. Leaf cells ($\times 300$):

Fig. vi. *Loph. bidentatum*, v. *gracile*.

1. Stem ($\times 20$). 2. One of the leaves ($\times 120$). 3. Areolæ ($\times 300$). 4. Amphigastrium.

Fig. vii. *Lepidox. tumidula*, Tayl.

1. Stem leaves and amphigastria ($\times 20$). 2. Areolæ ($\times 300$). 3. Perianth and involucre. 4. Involucreal leaves.

Fig. viii. *Lep. reptans*.

1. Stem leaf and amphigastrium ($\times 20$). 2. Areolæ ($\times 300$).

II. On some British Cyperaceæ recently discussed by Dr Carrington. By CHARLES C. BABINGTON, M.A., Professor of Botany, Cambridge.

It is only within the last few weeks that I have become acquainted with the "Notes upon the Cyperaceæ," by Dr Carrington, contained in the "Transactions of the Botanical Society" (vol. vii. pp. 259 and 320). Having read them with much interest, I may be allowed, and indeed perhaps I am called upon, to make a few remarks upon the species there noticed. They are chiefly in confirmation of Dr Carrington's statements.

(1.) *Carex Grahmi*, Boott.—It is quite possible that this may be a monstrous form of *C. pulla*, Good., but I am much more inclined to agree with Dr Boott in believing it to be distinct. I possess a considerable quantity of the ripe utricles of *C. Grahmi*, derived from plants cultivated in the late Mr Borrer's garden. In such of them as I have opened I find what seem to be ripe nuts. These are pale yellow, not half as long as the utricle, about $\frac{1}{15}$ of an inch long, oblong, compressed,

or trigonous (except very near their base, which is usually triquetrous), prolonged into a very long beak at the top, which is often curved, on account of its length exceeding the space between the nut and the contracted mouth of the utricle. The termination of this beak of the nut is not marked by any decided joining between it and the style; but probably the lower part, which is terete, belongs to the nut, and the compressed or triquetrous part (which is often half its length) is the base of the style. In this upper part the colour gradually changes from the pale yellow of the nut to the fuscous tint of the true style.

Unfortunately I cannot find a ripe utricle of *C. pulla* to contrast with that of *C. Grahami*. In Kunth's "Cyperographia" (411), the nut of *C. pulla* is described as follows:—*achenium subrotundum, mucronatum, biconvexum, subtiliter punctulatum, pallidum.*" This is the only description of it that I can find. Dr Carrington does not describe the nut, but gives a figure of it, which certainly cannot be called "subrotundum," and is difficult to describe in few words; it is nearly twice as long as broad, cuspidate (if that term is understood as defined by me in the "Manual," ed. 5, p. 12, and figured by Lindley in his "Introduction," ed. 4, vol. ii. p. 356, § 3), with nearly parallel sides. It is at least twice as long, relatively to the utricle, as that of *C. Grahami*.

Perhaps a few words may be allowed concerning the name of the plant. I call it *C. pulla*, after Goodenough, and am thus in accordance with a considerable number of the best writers. Anderson remarks (*Plantæ Scandinaviæ Cyperographia*, p. 19); *quod ad C. saxatile Linnæi attinet, in Herb. Reg. Acad., Sc. Holmiensis specimen asservatur a Dno Montin, Linnæi contemporaneo, in Lapponia lectum et C. saxatilis (Linn.) inscriptum, quod aperte ad C. rigidam referendum; aliud tamen a collectione Dni Solander, C. pullæ proprius accedit.* It seems most probable that Linnæus originally intended to designate *C. pulla* by the name of *C. saxatilis*, but afterwards he unquestionably included *C. rigida* under that name, and probably made it the type of the species. As the name *C. saxatilis* is most variously used by authors, and as there still remains some reasonable doubt concerning the Linnean plant, I consider it best to use names for the plants about which there is no ambiguity, viz., *C. pulla* and *C. rigida*. I should be much obliged to any Scottish botanist who would send to me the ripe fruit of *C. pulla*.

(2.) *Eleocharis Watsoni*, Bab.—I have only one difficulty in arriving at the same conclusion as Dr Carrington, namely, that *E. Watsoni* is a state or variety of *E. uniglumis*, Link. That difficulty is, that Mr D. Moore (who found *E. Watsoni* on the Murrow of Wicklow, in flower in May 1862), informs me by letter, that "the roots are tufted, scarcely creeping at all." If he is correct in this remark, and there is no reason to disbelieve him, *E. Watsoni* and *E. uniglumis* can hardly be the same species. *E. uniglumis* is a very far-creeping plant; very much more so than *E. palustris*. Mr Moore has the Wicklow plant in cultivation, and will therefore be able easily, in due time, to settle this question, and thus decide the specific identity or otherwise of the plants. The stems of the Wicklow plant are very much taller than those of the specimen (for there was but one) gathered at Taynloan; one of them is 13 inches long. But the plants seem to accord in all other respects. Dr Carrington objects to my terminology in describing the nuts; but there is very little difference between us. The nut of *E. palustris* is too short and broad to be called "exactly obovate," I mean when ripe, as I believe the nuts now before me to be. I have never seen it so relatively long as is represented in Plate VII. of the "Transactions." My description of *E. Watsoni*, founded upon very slight materials, is now shown to be erroneous; its nut is not "ob-

PLATE VII.

Trans. Bot. Soc. Vol. 7.

R. X. Greville, del.

CLERODENDRON THOMSONÆ, BALEFOUR.

W. H. W. 'Yucca' Lib. Edin.

long," but closely resembles what I find in *E. palustris*, although it is perhaps even slightly more obovate. In *E. uniglumis* also I find the fruit to be better described by pyriform (bluntly obovate, and more narrowed at the base than in obovate) than by "rotund-obovate."

(3.) *Scirpus Holoschœnus*, Linn.—I possess a single stem of the plant, said to have been found near Watchet in Somersetshire, which was given to me many years since by Professor Henslow, but by whom gathered it is now useless to inquire. As the late Professor sent a large quantity of duplicate specimens of British plants to the Botanical Society, it is probable that the piece received by Dr Carrington is part of the same set. The only authority for its being found near Watchet, is contained in Collinson's "History of Somerset," from whence it is copied into the "Botanist's Guide" (ii. 748) in the following form:—"Near the sea-side below Watchet," and from thence into the "New Botanist's Guide." It is one of a considerable number of localities of plants communicated to Collinson's work by Mr W. Sole, the author of the "British Mints," and is therefore probably correct. The record will be found in Collinson's book at page xxi of the Introduction. When printing the first edition of the "Manual," I believed that Mr Lingwood had gathered *S. Holoschœnus* at Watchet, but soon afterwards learned from him that he did not do so; neither could I learn by whom the specimens given away by Professor Henslow were gathered.

In the earlier part of the "Botanist's Guide" it was only stated to occur "on the sea-shore in this county (Somerset), Robson;" and that is all that we learn from Robson's "British Flora" (p. 240), except that he adds "Devon and Hampshire."

Other authors give Petiver and Ray as authorities for the Somerset station. Ray has very little to do with the matter. In his "Historia Plantarum" (ii. 1303), he says of the plant in question:—"Nuper etiam in Anglia detexit, in comitatu Somerseti D. Stephens." In the "Synopsis" (ed. 3, p. 429) he says, "found by Mr Stephens in Brounton Burroughs in Devonshire;" and Dillenius adds, "it also grows in Somersetshire and Hantshire; *Pet. Conc. Gr.*, 195." As the "Historia" was published long before this posthumous edition of the "Synopsis," this correction was doubtless made by Ray himself, who had learned that Somerset was put in the place of Devon in the "Historia." We are thus reduced to Petiver, who states, that "the Reverend Mr Stephens first found this in Devon; it also grows in Somerset and Hantshire." Therefore there is no trace of Watchet in these books, and the correctness of that station for *Scirpus Holoschœnus* rests upon the authority of Sole. It is greatly to be desired that the district should be carefully examined. It is of small extent, and the presence or absence of the plant might soon be ascertained.

III. Remarks on some Fibrous Plants of Madras. By Dr ALEXANDER HUNTER.

In this paper Dr Hunter says—From experiments that I have tried in cleaning fibres of a great number of Indian plants, I feel satisfied that the steeping and rotting process is not suited to the heat of the climate, as plants putrefy rapidly under water in India, and the fermentative process, which goes on for weeks sometimes in a cold climate, is occasionally completed in from twelve to eighteen hours in India, and is immediately succeeded by putrefaction, which discolours and takes the strength from fibres. The best method of separating the woody fibre and bark (or boon of flax,