

NOTE ON *EUCALYPTUS LINEARIS*, DEHNHARDT.

(A Supposed Tasmanian Species.)

By J. H. MAIDEN, Director Botanic Gardens, Sydney,  
Corresponding Member.

(Read July 8th, 1902.)

(Issued July 23rd, 1902.)

In a paper entitled "The Common Eucalyptus Flora of Tasmania and New South Wales," read by me before the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science at its Hobart meeting last January, I drew attention to a small smooth-barked Mount Wellington tree, closely related to *Eucalyptus amygdalina*, Labill., and considered to be *E. linearis*, Dehnhardt.

I have recently received for study, from the Imperial Natural History Museum of Vienna, a type specimen of Dehnhardt's species, which is, however, in bud only. The original label in Dehnhardt's handwriting is in German, of which the following is a translation:—

"I pray you read my description in the Catalogue. The tree is 40ft. high, with a slender stem, and flowers the second time."

The reference to the "Catalogue" is doubtless to the "Catalogus plantarum horti Camaldulensis," which contains the description of the species, and which I have given in full in my paper already referred to. The work in question was published at Naples, and I understand the Hortus Camaldulensis was a garden near that city. The first edition was published in 1829, and the second in 1832, and should be noted in case any claims for priority arise.

Dehnhardt's plant is, without doubt, a cultivated one, and bearing in mind the marked way in which seedling Eucalyptus plants differ from their parents, it is not likely to be absolutely identical with the Mount Wellington plants to which it has been referred. The idea becomes stronger with me that *E. linearis*, Dehn., will prove to be a perfectly smooth-barked form of *E. amygdalina*, with unusually thin, linear leaves. If so, this form of *E. amygdalina* might be named var. *linearis*.

My researches in European herbaria in regard to this genus has brought to light another named species which is con-specific with *E. linearis*. It is *E. pulchella*, Desfontaines.

The original work not being in any Australian library, I obtained a copy of the description from Kew. It is as follows:—

"*Eucalyptus pulchella*, Desf. Ramulis filiformibus; foliis alternis, lineari-subulatis: floribus axillaribus, umbellatis, operculo convexo, mucrone obtuso, brevissimo.

“Ramuli filiformes, paniculati. Folia uncias 2 longa, lineam 1 lata, utrinque acuta. Petioli breves. Flores in umbellulas axillares dispositi. Pedunculus communis folio multoties brevior, 10-12—florus.”

(*Cat Hort. Paris.* Ed. 3, 408, 1829.)

Dehnhardt contracts this description into:—

“*Eucalyptus pulchella*. Ramulis filiformibus; foliis alternis lineari-subulatis. Ramulis filiformibus panicularis. Folia uncias 2 longa, lineam 1 lata.”

(*Dehnh. Cat. Pl. Hort. Camald.* Ed. 2, p. 20.\*)

Walpers' description, published in 1845, is also adapted from the original, and is as follows:—

“Ramulis filiformib foll. alternis lineari-subulatis, florib. axillarib. umbellatis; operculo convexo, mucrone obtuso brevissimo.—Crescit——?”

(*Walpers' Repert.* III. 927.)

Bentham perhaps saw the species, but he pronounces it to be “very doubtful”

I have recently received some specimens from the Vienna Herbarium labelled “*E. pulchella*, Hort., Kew.” They are in bud, and are identical with *E. linearis*, Dehn.

Undoubtedly the name *pulchella* was well bestowed, for the specimens have especially long, narrow, linear leaves, which are very graceful.

The upshot of my investigation is that:—

*E. linearis*, Dehnhardt, and *E. pulchella*, Desfontaines, are specifically identical. Both were named from plants raised in Europe. In my Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science paper I have put forth a plea for a final investigation by Tasmanian botanists as to whether a certain Mount Wellington tree is identical with *E. linearis*, Dehnh., and, if so, whether it is con-specific with *E. amygdalina*, Labill.

---

\* In my A.A.A.S. paper I quote *E. pulchella*, and also *E. rubricaulis*, as they follow Dehnhardt's description of *E. linearis*. My identification of *E. pulchella* is given below. I have also seen *E. rubricaulis*, Desf., which is not identical with *E. linearis*, and may not be a *Eucalyptus* at all.