

coincided with the longer diagonal, was found to be 87 c. m. long and 1.9 c. m. at its greatest width. The included bark was so strongly compressed as to be very solid. With the second cut, the tension was largely released, and the crack almost immediately opened to 5.5. c. m. at its greatest width.

D. P. P.

*Sisyrinchium bermudiana*.—On first seeing the specimens of *Sisyrinchium* collected in the Bermudas by Sir J. H. Lefroy and Mr. Moseley, I suspected that they were specifically different from the plant commonly known as *Sisyrinchium bermudiana*, and after comparing them with numerous specimens of the plant so called from eastern North America, I was convinced that such was the case. Referring to the literature of the subject, I found this view supported by all the early writers who had actually seen the Bermudan plant. The history of the two species concerned is soon told. Towards the end of the seventeenth century Plukenet figured and briefly described what he termed the Bermudan and the Virginian *Sisyrinchii*, the types of which are still preserved in the Sloane Herbarium at the British Museum. Dillenius, who had opportunities of seeing living plants at Eltham, followed Plukenet in distinguishing these two species, and published better figures and more complete descriptions of them in the 'Hortus Elthamensis.' Linnaeus, who we assume did not see the Bermudan plant, as there is no specimen in his herbarium, united the two, as varieties of one, under the name of *S. bermudiana*. Miller, who seems to have been the most accomplished English botanist of his day, was the first to restore the two forms to specific rank. This was in 1771. In 1789 Curtis figured the true Bermudan plant, and insisted upon its specific rank, remarking that he had living plants before him of both the species figured by Dillenius. Unfortunately he gave it a new specific name, for which he afterwards expressed his regret. The first De Candolle wrote the text to the excellent figure of the Bermudian plant, which was published in Redouté's *Liliacées*, at the beginning of the present century, and he particularly points out its distinctive characters. I have not taken the trouble to turn up every book in which the two species are likely to be mentioned, and I have not ascertained who was the first botanist to reunite them; but the North American botanists seem to be agreed