



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Bibliographical Notes on well-known Plants.—VI.

BY EDWARD L. GREENE.

NYMPHÆA and NUPHAR.

Since the BULLETIN for September was printed, I have been able to establish as true all, and more than all, which I therein set forth as possible in relation to the priority of Salisbury's division of the old genus *Nymphæa* over that of Smith. The difference in time between the two is greater than I had assumed. Salisbury's monograph was certainly published in 1805, while so late as the middle of November, 1808, that part of the *Flora Græca* which was to exhibit Smith's disposal of these plants had not yet made its appearance. This is evident from a letter,* written by him at that time, to Dr. Samuel Goodenough, Bishop of Carlisle; and, therefore, Salisbury's *Nymphæa*, which is not that of Smith, antedates it not by one year only, but by three.

The action of Smith was a deliberate attempt to suppress—relegate to oblivion, if he might—Salisbury's monograph as a whole, and to banish his name, in so far as might be possible, from all connection with the nomenclature of these plants. This attempt was made, not without the necessary private consultation with the most scholarly members of his own botanical clique. Salisbury had made it clear to the mind of Sir James that the white water lilies and the yellow were generically different. I quote the language in which he opens the consultation with his Lordship of Carlisle. "Now I want your Lordship's advice, both critical and botanical. Mr. Salisbury [whom I wish in this case to consider as an indifferent person] makes *Nymphæa alba* a distinct genus from *lutea*, and I think rightly." He then proceeds to lay before his chosen counsellor the scheme by which he will make as little as he can of Salisbury's work. He offers sundry objections against *Castalia*, proposes to replace it by *Nymphæa*, and to give to the yellow water-lilies the name *Blephara*. So it appears we should have had that name instead of *Nuphar*, but for the Right Reverend Dr. Goodenough, who frowned upon it in a manner not uncourteous, and recommended in its stead *Nuphar* or *Madonia*, both of which, he showed his correspondent,

* Mem. and Corresp. Sir J. E. Smith, i. 576.

were classical names which had been applied to the plants by ancient authors. From Goodenough's spirited letter, emphatic in its expression of personal dislike of Salisbury as it is full of zeal for the honor of Grecian gods and goddesses, I must give a few passages. "I am glad now, as I have been at all times heretofore, to receive communications of your literary difficulties." (Sir James had been obliged to ask of him the gender of his proposed name *Blephara*.) "Much as I wish for peace and forbearance, and *condescension to men of low estate* [and in point of scholarship thus must I style Salisbury—of *very* low estate], I must hold up both my hands against allowing Salisbury to desecrate the name *Castalia*. To make the name of the nymph of the fountain where Apollo and all the Muses drank the purest lymph, serve for the denomination of a plant inhabiting foul, stagnating, fetid water, and that, too, in a *Flora Græca*, which is to preserve the memorial of all Grecian excellence in the natural world, will be an offense of the grossest sort: *Religio vetuit*. A bad name, Linnæus says, had better be retained than that a change should be made. But really there is reason in roasting of eggs. You cannot be bound down to a name that is execrable, and which must excite in all minds ideas of execration."

One can hardly fail to observe that, in the heat of feeling, the Bishop became a little inconsistent with himself; for in the beginning of his diatribe he holds *Castalia* a sacred name which Salisbury must not be allowed to desecrate, and concludes by pronouncing it execrable. But these are trivialities and do not gravely concern us. The principle now contended for along all popular lines of reform in nomenclature is this: that the oldest Linnæan or post-Linnæan names are those which genera must bear; and it is quite beyond all successful contradiction that *Castalia* of Salisbury is the oldest name, not pre-Linnæan, for the genus which men are still calling *Nymphæa*.

Note on the Color of *Caulophyllum thalictroides*.

Having seen Mr. Aug. F. Foerste's Morphological Note on *Caulophyllum thalictroides* in the July BULLETIN, I should like to call attention to the color of the plant as it grows on Mount Royal, Montreal. When it first comes up there in the spring, its