

be procured, in his delightful garden near Harlem. We have therefore much information to expect from your intended catalogue of this collection.

I perceive you take somewhat amiss what I wrote to Gronovius and Dillenius about your new method founded on the stamens and pistils. I was merely joking, in my letter to Gronovius, if I mistake not; and I could not suppose you would seriously be displeased, at my remarking the great concourse of husbands to one wife, which often happens, and which is so unsuitable to the laws and manners of our people here. I was not speaking of those natural laws of the vegetable kingdom, instituted by the Creator of all things. I observed to Dillenius that your system was excellent for establishing and defining the genera of plants, though scarcely of any use as to classes. I continue of the same opinion; for according to your method, plants which agree in the number of their stamens and pistils, though totally different in every other particular, are placed in the same class. What affinity is there, except in the number of their stamens, between *Valeriana* and *Cyperus*, *Persicaria* and *Campanula*, *Gentiana*, *Ribes*, and *Angelica*, &c.? I have read your *Flora Lapponica* quite through, and have found many plants mentioned and described therein, which grow wild about Petersburg. For example, your *Betula* with round crenate leaves*, a figure and description of which I communicated to our Academy two years since. You omit among your

* *B. nana*.