

Zeitschrift: Candollea : journal international de botanique systématique = international journal of systematic botany
Herausgeber: Conservatoire et Jardin botaniques de la Ville de Genève
Band: 6 (1934-1936)

Artikel: New or renamed spermatophytes mostly Peruvian II
Autor: MacBride, J. Francis
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-879095>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 01.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

NEW
OR RENAMED SPERMATOPHYTES
MOSTLY PERUVIAN II

BY

J. Francis MACBRIDE

The Director of the Conservatoire botanique again has honored me in giving space in *Candollea* for a series of notes and new descriptions of South American plants which I have found opportunity to study during the year that I have been happily a guest of Geneva and its famous botanical institutions.

And this time it gives me special pleasure to express here my thanks for this privilege of study and publication because this paper is based peculiarly on collections in the Conservatoire botanique or, if on those of the Field Museum, the latter have been studied in comparison with Genevan type material. The work, therefore, it seems to me, finds publication most naturally in the official botanical organ of Geneva, and I hope that it may contribute something to its interest. Cotype material or some representation of those plants proposed as new has been (or will be) incorporated in the Conservatoire's herbarium. The paper appears here with the kind permission of the Director of Field Museum of Natural History.

Deeply cognizant of the value to science internationally of the recent reorganization of Genevan botanical activities which has resulted in the coordination of the Conservatoire Botanique with the herbarium Boissier, I wish to call attention to it here and do so with great satisfaction, a feeling shared, of course, by all sincere botanists everywhere interested in the natural development of the science cooperatively in all its phases.

This happy arrangement will undoubtedly be a great advantage to botanical students who should be attracted to the University of Geneva from all the world by the wonderful combination there of distinguished botanical leadership and wealth of materials nowhere surpassed.

Dioscorea coripatensis Macbr. nom. nov. = *D. glauca* Rusby, in *Bull. N. Y. Bot. Gard.* 4: 459 (1907), not Mühlb. ex Beck, *Bot. U. S.* 355 (1833).

Knuth, *Pflanzenreich* 87: 173 (1924), treats the latter of the two *Dioscoreas* cited above as «subsp. *D. glauca* Mühlb.», a designation that to say the least is cryptic; presumably it is a binomial and accepted, and so is in conflict with Rusby's name. However according to the present Rules the name of Rusby is in any case not tenable. His species, therefore, known first from Coripata, Bolivia, may bear the name of the locality.

Berberis Hochreutinerana Macbr. spec. nov. — Frutex vel arbor spinosus; spinis 3-fidis, spina media 7 mm. longa, basi vix 1 mm. crassa, spinis lateralibus 5 mm. longis; ramulis glabris vix angulatis; foliis ramulorum abbreviatorum circa 7-fasciculatis oblongo-ob lanceolatis plerumque 7 vel 8 cm. longis et circa 3 cm. latis vel interdum ad 10 cm. longis, 4-5 cm. latis, apice rotundatis, basi in petiolum cuneato-attenuatis integerrimis chartaceo-coriaceis haud manifeste papillois, supra tenuiter denseque reticulato-venosis pallido-viridibus nitidulis, subtus pallidioribus opacis nervis mediocriter prominulis minute parceque pulverulentis; petiolis ad 1 cm. longis vaginatis ad vaginam articulatis, vaginis persistentibus fere interdum 1 cm. longis; inflorescentiis paniculatis multifloris solitariis e medio fasciculorum foliorum pseudoterminalibus ad 1.5 dm. longis distincte puberulentis; bracteis anguste triangularibus longe cuspidatis 3-4 mm. longis; pedicellis raro nutantibus ad 7 mm. longis; sepalis ad 5.5 mm. longis rotundato-ellipticis; petalis obovatis vix 5 mm. longis, 4 mm. latis, basi valde contractis, biglandulosis; staminibus fere 3.5 mm. longis, connectivo paullo vel vix producto; stylo prominente capitato-dilatato. — Peru: Mount Acomayo, 3100 m. (*Weberbauer* 6831 type, Field Museum).

This beautifully foliaged species with ample flower-panicles is evidently closely related to *B. Lehmannii* Hieron. of Colombia which, however, is glabrous, has thinner longer-petioled leaves and nodding flowers with different characters.

It is a pleasure to add another illustrious Geneva name to a genus in which one finds already the related Peruvian species *B. Beauverdiana* Schn. and *B. Barbeyana* Schn.

Berberis rotunda Macbr. spec. nov. — Frutex spinosus; ramis teretibus, cortice lenticellis oblecto, juvenilibus puberulis; petiolis 1-2 mm. longis; foliis approximatis subrotundatis plerumque circa 2.5 cm. latis et longis, basi rotundatis vel leviter cordatis, apice breviter acutis vel interdum paulum acuminatis margine parce crenulatis vel serrato-crenulatis, chartaceo-coriaceis, utrinque nervis manifeste prominulis reticulatis, supra nitidulis subtus opacis papillis instructis; floribus 2-3-fasciculatis in axillis foliorum vel in racemis brevibus terminalibus dispositis; bracteis circa 2 mm. longis ciliatis; pedicellis usque ad 5 mm. longis glabris; sepalis rotundatis ad 4 mm. longis; petalis breviter ciliatis basi biglandulosis quam sepala interna vix longioribus sed angustioribus; staminibus 2.5 mm. longis, connectivo obtuso non producto. — Peru: without locality (*Weberbauer* 7218 type, Field Museum); also 7220.

Among the twenty five species of *Berberis* known from Peru this is unique in characters of leaves and inflorescence and from the characters available in this material I have not succeeded in determining the possible relationship.

Berberis buceronis Macbr. spec. nov. — Frutex spinosus; ramulis flexuosis, teretibus glabris; spinis 2-(3) fidis subaequilongis 7 mm. longis, basi 1.5 mm. crassis bene curvatis; petiolis gracilibus 1-2.5 cm. longis, minutissime pulverulentis circa 5-fasciculatis; foliis fere rotundatis, basi plerumque valde cordatis et circa 3 cm. vel ad 4 cm. longis et latis, chartaceis supra nitidulis, nervis cum venis paullo notatis, subtus paullo pallidioribus opacis papillois prominente reticulato-venosis, margine undulato-spinuloso-dentatis, spinulis vix 1 mm. longis, 2-5 mm. remotis; inflorescentiis racemosis vel subpaniculatis 2-4 e medio fasciculorum foliorum pedunculatis foliis paullo superantibus granuloso-pulverulentis; pedicellis ad 10 mm. longis; sepalis oblongo-ellipticis ad fere 5 mm. longis; petalis late obovatis basi biglandulosis 5 mm. longis; staminibus 3.5 mm. longis, connectivo producto obtuso; stylo prominente capitato-dilatato. — Peru: without locality (*Weberbauer* 6994 type, Field Museum).

If a member of the *Paniculatae* perhaps allied to *B. multiflora* Benth. with elliptic-oblong leaves but in the style suggesting the *Ilicifoliae* and especially *B. Weberbaueri* Schn. which has leaves truncate at base and straight slender spines.

Berberis brumalis Macbr. spec. nov. — Frutex glaberrimus, ut videtur spinosus ; ramulis subteretibus flavo-viridibus ; foliis 5-7-fasciculatis ; petiolis basi breviter vaginato-dilatatis circa 7 mm. longis valde canaliculatis, articulatione infra laminam sita, laminis ellipticis vel oblongo-ellipticis plerumque circa 4 cm. longis et 2 cm. latis, basi rotundato-acutis spinuloso-cuspidatis, margine revolutis integerrimis vel 2-3 remote spinulosis coriaceis supra nitidis pallidis obscure minuteque reticulato-venosis, subtus opacis papillois glauco-viridibus, nervis venulisque vix manifestis ; inflorescentiis e medio fasciculorum foliorum (sed in specimine valde deficientibus) ; pedicellis circa 1 cm. longis, glabris ; sepalis petalisque vix 3.5 mm. longis, minute ciliatis ; staminibus ut videtur vix 2 mm. longis, connectivo valde producto. — Peru : without locality (*Weberbauer* 6799 type, Field Museum).

Probably a member of the *Paniculatae* and in spite of the imperfect and very young material which lacks an inflorescence apparently not referable to any species in that series. Among Peruvian forms it suggests most *B. Beauverdiana* Schn. with leaves lustrous both sides or *B. Barbeyana* Schn. with narrower leaves, almost white-pruinose beneath.

Bernardinia fluminensis Gardner in *Hook. Lond. Journ. Bot.* 1 : 529. (1842) = *B. comans* (Casar.) Schellenb. in *Candollea* 2 : 103. (1925) = *Omphalobium comans* Casar. *Nov. Stirp. Br. Dec.* 10 : 84 (1845).

Schellenberg, l. c., gives the date of publication for Casaretto's work as « 1842 » but the title page of the copy in the library of the Conservatoire Botanique is dated « 1845 ». Therefore Gardner's name for this Brazilian member of the *Connaraceae*, having priority, is to be retained.

Pithecollobium¹ **samaningua** (Pittier) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Samanea samanigua* Pittier, *Arbol. y Arbus. Venzl.* 54 (1925) in *Bol. Cient. Mus. Com. Venzl.* 1 : 54 (1925).

In *Contrib. Gray Herb.* 59 : 2 (1919) I supported Merrill's generic separation, *Journ. Wash. Acad. Sc.* 6 : 42 (1916) of the section *Samanea* of *Pithecollobium*. For some time I have questioned my earlier judgment and now, with my attention called again to the group by finding in the Conservatoire Botanique the above species under the name « *Samanea* » I wish to take occasion to refute my former decision.

¹ Original orthography.

My argument that we must distinguish *Samanea* or unite, as Mueller proposed, *Calliandra* and *Pithecollobium* with *Albizzia* because all four groups are equally marked as to characters of fruit may be logic but it is not, at least here, common sense. Among closely related groups the lines of demarcation are often poorly defined and the limitations of the apparently natural divisions, as genera, may best depend on the general average reliability of all the characters that appear available. Bentham himself was well-aware of the fallibility of generic diagnosis here, all species considered; nevertheless their scientific classification will be very questionably furthered by creating more genera in an attempt to portray the aberrancies; it will be more practical and give a clearer picture of the actual state in nature to follow Bentham and attempt to portray the normalities. By either method the exceptional species will be difficult enough to «find», - but surely their real position will be best expressed by leaving them as connecting entities between the fairly well-defined groups of species. The latter, by their very majority in species-number offer proof of the naturalness of their designation. Otherwise sight is lost of all basic relationship. The species cited above, *P. samanigua* may according to its author constitute a generic type when mature fruit is known! But Bentham in *Trans. Linn. Soc.* 30: 570 (1875), wrote of *Pithecollobium* «the pod is often very different in species *otherwise closely allied*» (the italics are mine). In the judgment, then, of this master student too much significance can be placed on the character of the pod. Standley, too, well-known for his considerate interpretation of generic lines has let *Pithecollobium* include *Samanea* in his practical «Flora of the Panama Canal Zone» in *Contrib. U. S. Nat. Herb.* 27: 196 (1927). Indeed in floristic work if not in monographic treatments, Mueller's suggestion already referred to might be feasible and certainly would be preferable to the segregation recently undertaken to the confusion of the actual state of affairs.

Pithecollobium corymbosum [Rich.] Bth. = ? *Mimosa corymbosa* Rich. in *Act. Soc. Hist. Nat. Par.* 115 (1792) = *Inga trapeziformis* Steud. in *Flora* 759 (1843) = *Pithecollobium corymbosum* Bth. in *Hook. Lond. Journ. Bot.* 3: 221 (1844).

Bentham in *Mart. Fl. Bras.* 15. 2: 441 (1876), suggested the possible identity of Richard's plant with his *Pithecollobium corymbosum* and comparison of cotype material of the former (by Leblond) in the Conserva-

toire Botanique of Geneva discloses no essential differences from cotype specimens of the latter (Schomburgk 114) nor from that of Steudel 262, the type number of *Inga trapeziformis*. The species evidently varies slightly in the form of the leaflets and in pubescence but these variations exhibit no concomitance with each other or with characters of more significance. There are therefore three names available for this tree of northern South America and, as it is a true *Pithecollobium*, the question arises as to which specific name is correct under current nomenclatorial practice.

Now it is to be noted that when Bentham published his species he was unaware of the existence of that of Richard and quite accidentally employed the same adjective. The names therefore are based clearly upon different collections and according to Article 61 of the International Rules (cf. *Journ. of Bot.* suppl. June 1934) which reads « a name must be rejected if it duplicates a name previously and validly published for a group of the same rank *based on a different type* », it would seem possible to argue with certain logic that the name of Richard cannot be employed in *Pithecollobium* because of the existence there already of the name « *corymbosum* », founded on a different type. In this case, one would be obliged to take up the name of Steudel, as being next available.

However, this, one may say ridiculous nomenclatorial situation, seems avoidable as Dr. Hochreutiner has thoughtfully suggested, by Article 18 of the Rules which reads « A nomenclatorial type is that constituent element of a group to which the name of the group is permanently attached, whether as an accepted name or as a synonym ». Therefore, by maintaining that the type of this species is Leblond, one holds the name of Richard as permanently attached thereto and, inasmuch, as a matter of fact, Bentham's name applies to the same species, his name is not in conflict.

In the spirit of the Rules, at least, then, and in common sense, the legal name for this tree seems to me to be *Pithecollobium corymbosum* [Rich.] Bth. emend.

But would not the disadvantage of possible confusion and apparent contradiction in the wording of the Article 61 be removed in this and similar cases by substituting the word *species* for *type* so that the essential phrase would read « for a group of the same rank based on a diffe-

rent species » ? It would then be clear that there is no conflict in names here because only one species is concerned. Or, an alternative less preferable, would be to refer in Article 61 to Article 18. .

Geranium Jaekelae Macbr. nom. nov. = *G. minimum* Knuth in *Bot. Jahrb.* 37 : 567 (1906) not Cav. *Diss.* 4 : 260 (1787).

This delicate and tiny *Geranium* is one of the constituents of the curious « polsters » that form in the high (4000 m. or more) meadows of the Andes. It is the smallest Peruvian species and is distinctive in its smooth leaves.

With pleasure, since, as indicated above, it requires a new name, that assigned it by Professor Knuth being already occupied in the genus, I designate it as *Geranium Jaekelae* in well-merited botanical recognition to Annemarie Jaekel (Mrs. Dr. A. Hirsch) who with rare devotion applied for five years her exceptionnal ability to producing the Field Museum-Rockefeller Foundation collection of type photographs to the extent of over 25000. Their uniform value as plant-portraits is due entirely to her faithful and unselfish interest, thus furthering the tradition in scientific work established in her family by her distinguished father.

Geranium sibbaldioides Benth. *Pl. Hartw.* 2 : 166 (1843) = *G. cucullatum* H.B.K. *Nov. Gen.* 5 : 179 (1821), not L. = *G. ciliatum* Willd. ex Spreng. *Syst.* 3 : 71 (1826), not Cav.

Var. **elongatum** (Wedd.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *G. cucullatum* H.B.K. var. *elongatum* Wedd. *Chloris And.* 2 : 285 (1857).

The first available name for this Andean species is that of Bentham as indicated. The name *ciliatum* being already preoccupied for use here it is likewise preempted for the Chilian *G. ciliatum* Phil. which may become:

Geranium Philippii Macbr. nom. nov. = *G. ciliatum* Phil. in *Anal. Univ. Santiag.* 82 : 727 (1893), not Cav. *Diss.* 4 : 234 (1787).

Geranium Knuthianum Macbr. nom. nov. = *G. elongatum* Knuth in *Engl. Pflzr.* 129 : 209 (1912) not Cav. *Diss.* 4 : 233 (1787).

Although as yet known only from Ecuador this species probably has a wider distribution.

Oxalis minima R. et P. ex G. Don, *Gen. Syst.* 1: 760 (1830). = *O. Ruizii* Knuth in *Engl. Pflzr.* 130 : 248 (1926).

As the above is the first valid use of the name *minima* in the genus it is to be retained as the name for this Peruvian species. The African species *O. minima* Sond., however, accepted by Knuth, l. c. 355, must be called :

Oxalis Sonderana (Ktze.)[¶] Macbr., comb. nov. = *Acetosella Sonderana* Ktze. *Rev. Gen.* 1: 91 (1891) = *O. minima* Sond. in Harv. & Sond. *Fl. Cap.* 1: 336 (1859-60), not R. & P. ex G. Don. *Gen. Syst.* 1: 760 (1830) = *O. nidulans* Turcz. in *Bull. Soc. Nat. Mosc.* 31. 1: 436 (1858) not Eckl. & Zeyh. *Enum.* 1: 92 (1836).

There is an *O. Sonderi* Knuth which, however, does not preclude the use of the form *Sonderana*.

Oxalis peruviana Norlind, *Arkiv Bot.* 20A: 5 (1926) = *O. fruticosa* Knuth in *Notizbl.* 7 : 297 (1919) not Raddi in *Mem. Soc. Ital. Mod.* 18 Fis. : 401 (1820).

The correct name for this species is as above. The later published *O. peruviana* [Standl.] Knuth in *Engl. Pflzr.* 130 : 67 (1930) requires a new name if it is a valid species which seems extremely doubtful, Knuth himself remarking « Forsan *O. ramulosae* R. Knuth synonyma » and he gives no distinction in his key. One wonders, especially in a monograph, why, under these circumstances so doubtful he took up Standley's herbarium name !

Oxalis aetheria Macbr. nom. nov. = *Oxalis pygmaea* Gray, *Bot. U. S. Expl. Exped.* 1: 523 (1854) not E. Mey. in Drège, *Zwei Pfl. Dokum.* 155 (1844).

In as much as there is already an *Oxalis Grayi* this diminutive annual of Peru and Bolivia, requiring a new name as indicated, may become *Oxalis aetheria*.

Oxalis rufescens Turcz. in *Bull. Soc. Mosc.* 31 : 430 (1858) = *O. rufopilosa* Schult. ex Prog. in Mart. *Fl. Bras.* 12. 2 : 477 (1877).

It may be worthwhile to note that the correct name for this species of Ecuador and Peru is as above notwithstanding the existence of the name *O. rufescens* Willd. ex Zucc. in *Denkschr. Akad. Muench.* 9: 162 (1823-4), according to Knuth. As a matter of fact the Willdenow name is unpublished and as a name only it is not in conflict with the later *O. rufescens* Turcz.

Oxalis spiralis R. & P. ex G. Don, *Gen. Syst.* 1: 755 (1831) = *O. pubescens* H.B.K. *Nov. Gen.* 5: 186 (1821), not Stokes, *Bot. Mat. Med.* 2: 558 (1812).

Var. ***glandulosa*** (Knuth) Macbr. comb. nov. = *O. pubescens* R. & P. var. *glandulosa* Knuth in *Notizb.* 7: 298, 87 (1919).

The name of Ruiz and Pavon, as indicated, is the correct one for this distinct Andean species. Knuth cites an *O. bifida* Willd. as a synonym but this is an unpublished name that anyway would be in conflict with *O. bifida* Thunb.

Oxalis Hochreutineri Macbr. nom. nov. = *O. patula* Knuth, in *Notizb.* 7: 302 (1919) not Eckl. & Zeyh. *Enum.* 1: 87 (1836).

A beautiful Peruvian species, entirely distinct by virtue of its elegant arachnoid pubescence. It shall bear the name of my friend.

Cassia laeta H.B.K. *Nov. Gen.* 6: 340 (1824) = *Cassia Weberbaueri* Macbr. *Field Mus. Bot.* 8: 92 (1930).

Naturally it is with regret that I discover, from specimens in fruit of *C. laeta* H.B.K. by Gaudichaud from Guayaquil, preserved in the Conservatoire, that with scarcely a doubt my *C. Weberbaueri* is the same. Gaudichaud's material, from the type-locality, supplies the characters of the fruit (similar to those described by me) which lacked completely in the original description and which perhaps explains my overlooking *C. laeta*.

Tipuana tipu (Benth.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Machaerium Tipu* Benth. in Hook. *Kew. Journ. Bot.* 5: 267 (1853) = *T. speciosa* Benth. in Mart. *Fl. Bras.* 13. 1: 260 (1862) = *T. tipa* Benth. ex Lillo *Contrib. Conoc. Arb. Argent.* 58 (1910).

Although the native name of this South American tree seems, in fact, to be «tipa» instead of «tipu» as Bentham quoted Tweedie the word «tipu» as originally employed by the author of the species is of necessity to be retained as the correct scientific name. Lorentz labels record the native name as «tipa» and Lillo recently has followed or verified the term.

Tipuana mucronata (Benth.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Machaerium mucronatum* Benth. in Hook. *Journ. Bot.* 2 : 67 (1840) = *T. macrocarpa* Benth. in Mart. *Fl. Bras.* 13. 1 : 259 (1862).

The priority and validity of the first name employed by Bentham seems clear and accordingly it is herewith transferred to the accepted genus.

Desmodium album (Schindl.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Meibomia alba* Schindl. *Rep. Nov. Spec.* 20 : 150 (1924).

This Paraguayan species, based on Hassler 5993 and 5992, was referred by Chodat and Hassler in *Bull. Herb. Boiss.* 2. 4 : 889 (1904) to *D. discolor* Vog. Though probably closely related to that Brazilian species, it seems to be distinct as its fruits are pubescent instead of glabrous and, especially, their segments are evidently longer than broad; the ruit-articulations of *D. discolor* are suborbicular. In *Field Mus. Bot.* 8 : 101 (1930) and l. c. 11 : 23 (1931), I have expressed the opinion that the generic concept of *Desmodium* should be drawn to include as sections *Meibomia* and *Nephromeria*. In this case, *Desmodium* is the *conserved* name.

Psoralea monosperma (Griseb.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Rhynchosia monosperma* Griseb. *Goett. Abh.* 19 : 123 [75] (1874) = *P. Higuera* Griseb. l. c. 24 : 99 (1879) ?

This species is represented in the Conservatoire Botanique by Lorentz and Hieronymus n. 538 from near Salta, Argentina and seems to be well-distinct from *P. Higerilla* Gillies ex H. & A. in Hook. *Bot. Misc.* 3 : 181 (1833-4), known to me only from description. But the fruit of the latter is described as «subglobose» which is not at all true for that of *P. monosperma* which is oblong-rhomboid with a deltoid tip. I have also not seen the later published *P. Higuera* but from description it appears to be exactly *P. monosperma*.

Heteropterys multiflora Hochr. *Bull. N. Y. Bot. Gard.* 6 : 277 (1910) = *Malpighia reticulata* Poir. *Encycl. Supp.* 4 : 8 (1816) = *H. reticulata* (Poir.) Ndz. in *Arb. Bot. Inst. Lyc.* 2 : 54 (1903), not Griseb. in Mart. *Fl. Bras.* 12. 1 : 71 (1858).

In spite of the fact that Dr. Hochreutiner showed clearly, i. c., that Poiret's name could not be taken up for this species because of the existence already in the genus of the name « reticulata », Niedenzu has perpetuated in his monograph in *Pflanzenreich* 141: 374 (1928) his error and employed the untenable name, changing that of Grisebach to *H. Grisebachiana* Ndz.! The latter of course, is an unnecessary name-change and becomes a synonym of *H. reticulata* Griseb. *H. multiflora* Hochr. is then the valid name for *Malpighia reticulata* Poir. notwithstanding no less an authority than the *Pflanzenreich*.

The last remark is made thoughtfully for it is certainly unfortunate that this reference work which presumably would and should establish a criterion for botanical method is so often not to be trusted in its use of names, that is granting that the intent of the editors is for the work to accord with the International Rules of Nomenclature. Their acceptance of untenable names as that cited above or names otherwise invalid is too frequent in recent volumes to be interpreted easily as the mistakes of carelessness.

Heteropterys platyptera DC. *Prod.* 1: 592 (1824) = *Banisteria longifolia* Sw. *Prod.* 75 (1788) = *H. longifolia* (Sw.) Ndz. in *Arb. Bot. Inst. Lyc.* 2 : 53 (1903) not H.B.K. *Nov. Gen.* 5: 166 (1821) = *B. macrocarpa* Pers. *Syn.* 1: 507 (1805-7) not *H. macrocarpa* Kralik, (1908).

Dr. Hochreutiner in *Bull. N. Y. Bot. Gard.* 6 : 278 (1910), called attention to the possible conflict in names here and anticipated the need, as now... a quarter of a century later !... expressed in the new Rules, to regard homonyms as in conflict. As he pointed out, *H. longifolia* is by Niedenzu himself not considered *exactly* the same as *H. laurifolia* Juss. and therefore is in any case questionably not valid. This is an excellent illustration of the much more practical working of the new Rule by which the next available name is to be used for this species regardless of the validity of *H. longifolia* H.B.K. As Niedenzu separates the species into two varieties these then become :

Var. **borealis** (Ndz.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *H. longifolia* (Sw.) Ndz. var. *borealis* Ndz. in *Arb. Bot. Inst. Lyc. 2.* : 53 (1903).

Var. **martinicensis** (Ndz.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *H. longifolia* (Sw.) Ndz. var. *martinicensis* Ndz. l. c. 54.

This last is apparently equivalent to the typical state of the species. In *Candollea* 5: 380-381 (1934) I remarked on the practical validity of the name *Heteropterys* in its established sense; it is a name to be extra-legalized by the Committee established for the purpose in accord with the new Rules.

Paullinia Sprucei Macbr. nom. nov. = *P. riparia* (Spruce) Radlk. *Monog. Serj.* 75 (1874-75) not H.B.K. *Nov. Gen.* 5: 90 (1821).

The type of this Peruvian species is Spruce n. 3883, *Castenella riparia* Spruce, in herb. As Spruce's specific name, as adopted by Radlkofer, is not tenable, the liana may bear that of the collector.

Turnera luminosa Macbr. spec. nov. — Frutex ad 1 m. altus; ramulis obscure striatis cum pilis erectis adpressis sparse pubescentibus demum glabris; stipulis subulatis 1 mm. longis; petiolis 2 - 3.5 mm. longis eglandulosis; foliis anguste elliptico-lanceolatis utrinque cuneato-acutis 4-7 cm. longis, 1.5 - 2 cm. latis, margine (praeter ad apicem et ad basin integris) undulato-crenatis vel acute serrulatis, pallide-viridibus lucido-membranaceis nervis praecipue subtus parce hirsutulis exceptis glabris; nervis nervulisque utrinque prominentibus; floribus in axillis foliorum solitariis; pedunculis 5-10 mm. longis; pedicellis 4-5 mm. longis; calyce adpresse piloso-hirsutulo 7-9 mm. longo, anguste campanulato, lobis ovato-acuminatis, tubo intus piloso superne vix 4 mm. latis; petalis flavis fere 15 mm. longis; filamentis inferne pilosis; antheris longe apiculatis; styli glabri 6 mm. longi, longiores antheras 2 mm. superantes, apice flagellatim 5-7-fissi, flagello stylis circa 5-plo brevioribus; ovario glabro; valvis dorso verrucoso-reticulatis, seminibus valde arcuato-curvatis obovato-oblongis, superne attenuatis lacunoso-reticulatis, parce pilosiusculis. — Peru: Urubamba Valley, near Quillabamba, Dept. Cuzco (*Weberbauer* 7952, type, Field Museum).

Belonging to the series *Salicifoliae* and nearest *T. Weddelliana* Urb. & Rolfe of Paraguay from which its larger flowers, narrower calyx and different styles seem to distinguish it. Apparently it is only the fifth species for the genus recorded from Peru.

Doliocarpus Rolandri Gmel. *Syst.* 805 (1791) var. **parcus** Macbr. var. nov. — Arbor ad 10 m. alta; foliis ad 2 dm. longis, fere 1.5 dm. latis parce undulato-denticulatis, subtus molliter pilosis; petiolis 2-3 cm. longis; pedicellis 2-5-fasciculatis 5-8 mm. longis. — Peru: Yurimaguas, Dept. Loreto (*Killip & Smith* 27545 type, Field Museum).

Possibly separable specifically from *D. Rolandri* but, in fruit, the characters apparent seem only to be the larger leaves and the paucity of flowers at each fascicle; and, as *D. Rolandri* is widely distributed, these differences are probably not particularly significant.

Doliocarpus aptus Macbr. sp. nov. — Scandens; ramis teretibus glabris, ramulis brevibus puberulis; foliis elliptico-obovatis integerimis apice obtuse breviter acuminatis vel fere obtusis, basi late cuneato-acutis, interdum 1.5 dm. longis et 8 cm. latis, plerumque circa 1 dm. longis et 6-7 cm. latis coriaceis vix nitidulis supra glabris subtus ad nervos sparse pilosiusculis et puberulis, nervis lateralibus circa 12, supra vix notatis subtus valde cum venis venulisque subreticulatis prominentibus; petiolis circa 2.5 cm. longis adpresse cum pilis brevibus et pilosis intermixtis pubescentibus; pedicellis 2-4-fasciculatis 2-2.5 mm. longis; petalis virido-albis suboblongis 5 mm. longis, externe pulverulentis, intus glabris; filamentis ad 7 mm. longis paulum flexuosis; antheris oblongis vix 1 mm. longis, connectivo paulum producto; ovario cum stylo densissime fulvo-piloso, stigma capitato-peltatum. — Peru: Mishuyacu near Iquitos (*Klug* 977 type, Field Museum).

Evidently this liana is comparable to *D. dentosus* Mart. of the subgenus *Othlis* from which it differs notably in its entire not at all acuminate leaves, pubescent beneath, shorter pedicels and pubescent style. The pubescence of the ovary is much longer than in the Martius species.

Var. **curtus** Macbr. var. nov. — Petiolis 5-10 mm. longis; foliis plerumque 7 cm. longis et circa 5 cm. latis; pedicellis vix 2 mm. longis. — Peru: Mishuyacu near Iquitos (*Klug* 714 type, Field Museum).

This seems to be the same as the typical form of the species described above, except as noted. The variation is striking, however, especially in the much shorter petioles.

Doliocarpus curtipes Macbr. spec. nov. — Scandens; ramulis parce piloso-hirsutulis; foliis membranaceis ovato-ellipticis acuminatis,

basi acutis, superne remote grosseque serrato-dentatis, dentibus mucronatis, utrinque minutissime sparseque lepidotis, subtus tantum ad nervos sparse pilosis, plerumque circa 1 dm. longis, 4.5 cm. latis; petiolis 3-4 mm. longis; floribus 5-6 mm. latis axillaribus fasciculatis, fasciculis 1-4-floris; pedicellis breviter denseque villosis 3 mm. longis; sepalis utrinque praecipue externo leviter sericeo-pubescentibus; petalis albis, intus ad basin sericeo-pubescentibus 5 mm. longis; filamentis circa 5 mm. longis, antheris oblongis; ovario breviter villoso, stylo glabro. — Peru: Mishuyacu near Iquitos (*Klug 771* type, Field Museum).

Like the preceding this is related to *D. dentosus* Mart. but lacks any marked characteristic and could be treated as a variety. It differs from the Brazilian species, however, in its much shorter pedicels and in its distinctly pubescent leaves, so that, in the absence of intermediate forms it may be separable.

Tetracera Williamsii Macbr. spec. nov. — Scandens; ramulis gracilibus flexuosis minute scabrellis valde in laminas papyraceas exfoliatis; foliis chartaceis pallide viridibus utrinque scabrellis supra etiam, praecipue costa media, parce asperulo-hirsutulis, subtus ad nervos (circa 14) conspicue adpresseque asperulis grosse undulato-dentatis, ellipticis vel oblongo-ellipticis basi rotundato-cuneatis in petiolum (circa 1 cm.) decurrentibus, apice abrupte caudato-acuminatis, 12 cm. longis, 6 cm. latis vel interdum ad 17 cm. longis; inflorescentiis mediocriter paniculatis, ramulis remotis 3-7-floris plus minusve cum pilis stellatis et scabrellis intermixtis pubescentibus hirsutulis; floribus ut videtur conspicuis circa 8 mm. latis; sepalis late ellipticis circa 5 mm. longis, externe glabris vel parcissime asperulo-puberulis, intus dense sericeo-villosis; petalis 6 mm. longis obovatis, apice minute crenulatis; filamentis 3 mm. longis ad basin brevissime connatis et longe hirsutis; ovaria 5, circa 5 mm. longa, in stylos glabros attenuata; capsulis ignotis. — Peru: along Rio Itaya (*Llewelyn Williams 54* type, Field Museum); also Rio Mazan near Iquitos, 8126.

I venture to propose this as new in this genus of closely related or variable species because it seems in its character of sepals to be comparable only with *T. Breyniana* from which its strongly toothed larger leaves easily distinguish it.

The collector, whose sincere work it may honor, recorded a common name as « Paujil-chacui ».

Davilla densa Macbr. spec. nov. — Frutex vel arbor; ramulis elongatis teretibus cum petiolis (1.5-2 cm. longis) dense fusco-viloso-hirsutulis ut videtur demum plus minusve glabratis; foliis in sicco brunneis rigido-chartaceis integerrimis vel obscurissime et remote denticulatis supra breviter asperulo-hirsutulis (medio in costa dense fusco-hirsutis) subtus molliter et dense villosis, fere ellipticis, 8 cm. longis et 5 cm. latis vel demum interdum fere 2 dm. longis et 1 dm. latis, apice acutis vel breviter acuminatis, basi plus minusve rotundatis, abrupte in petiolum alato-decurrentibus; inflorescentiis densissimis ubique fusco-villosis; pedicellis numerosissimis 2-4 mm. longis; sepalis pericarpicis chartaceis, utrinque fulvo-pilosis conjunctim globosis (vix 5 mm. crassis) intus glaberrimis lucidis. — Peru: Yurimaguas (*Williams* 3826 type, Field Museum); also (*Killip & Smith* 27548).

The type was noted as a liana but the other collectors record the plant as a « shrub or small tree with elongate branches ». Except for the extraordinary density of the inflorescence apparently smaller flowers and perhaps its more nearly entire leaves, it is very similar to *D. Kunthii* to which possibly it could be referred, at least as a variety.

Grias Neuberthii Macbr. *Field Mus. Bot.* 11: 30 (1931) = *G. lorentensis* Knuth *Rep. Spec. Nov.* 35: 339 (1934).

Professor R. Knuth has recently, l. c., referred to the above species of *Grias* two collections from Iquitos, Peru, in addition to the type, *Williams* 2337 from Caballo-Cocha. It is interesting to find that this tree, sometimes 15m. high, is apparently not uncommon in the Amazonian region. It was first collected in 1929, not 1829, as the author of *G. lorentensis* (of course no doubt by typographical error) informs us.

Less understandable, however, is his failure to accept the name *Grias Neuberthii*. I take therefore this occasion to remark that this species was named for the Custodian of the Herbarium of Field Museum, the late Carl Neuberth, born a German, who for more than thirty years served botanical science with a conscientiousness rarely equalled.

Cassipourea Poeppigii Briq. in *Candollea* 4: 349 (1931), has recently been found at Iquitos, Peru, by Klug (455; 1219). These specimens match the type in the Conservatoire Botanique and seem to establish the species as distinct from *C. elliptica* (Sw.) Poir. to which, however, it is closely allied.

Niphogeton dissecta (Benth.) Macbr. var. **ciliata** (Wedd.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Oreosciadium dissectum* (Benth.) Wedd. var. *ciliatum* Wedd. *Chloris And.* 2: 204 (1857) = *Apium dissectum* (Benth.) Drude, var. *ciliatum* Wedd. ex Wolff in Engler *Pflzr.* 288: 49 (1927).

Good cotype material, Funck & Schlim 1150 and Linden 414, of this Venezuelan variant of the Andean typical form of the species is in the Conservatoire Botanique. It differs rather markedly from the typical glabrous state in that the leaves sheathes and peduncles are distinctly ciliate-hirsutulous. I suppose it could be separated as a species but in view of the existence of *N. dissecta* var. *aspera* (Wedd.) Macbr. *Field Mus. Bot.* 8: 125 (1930) which is minutely asperous its relationship seems best expressed by leaving it as Weddell proposed as a variety, probably geographically isolated. The variety *aspera*, it should be noted, is not to be reduced to *N. scabra* (Wolff) Macbr. as I recently suggested, *Candollea* 5: 395 (1934).

Clethra guianensis Kl. ex Meisn. in Mart. *Fl. Brasil.* VII, 170.

Var. **brevis** Macbr. var. nov. — Arbor ad 5 m. alta; pedicellis 0.5 ad vix 1 mm. longis. — Peru: Chanchamayo Valley, Junin (*Schunke* 194 type, Field Museum); San Ramón (*Killip & Smith* 24771).

The species of *Clethra* seem to be so poorly defined or, perhaps rather so inadequately interpreted that I hesitate to propose this tree as more than a variant of the shrub of British Guiana from which, indeed, it seems to be inseparable, except as noted. Cotype material is available at Geneva. Both collections of the variety are from essentially the same locality.

Weigeltia silvestris Macbr. spec. nov. — Fruticulus simplex ad 6 dm. altus, cortice fusco juventute parce puberulo; foliis ellipticis vel oblongo-ellipticis utrinque breviter acuminatis (basin versus sensim in petiolum 10-12 mm. longum attenuatis) 1.5-2 dm. longis,

8(5)-10 cm. latis integerrimis papyraceis olivaceis (subtus pallidioribus) utrinque praecipue subtus copiose reticulato-venulosis, praeter punctulis paucis obscuris glabris; inflorescentiis axillaribus racemosis vel anguste paniculatis minute parceque granuloso-pulverulentis 5-10 cm. longis; floribus 4-meris, 3-3.5 mm. latis bene remotis; bracteis persistentibus vel subpersistentibus 2 mm. longis, subulatis; pedicellis 1-1.5 mm. longis; sepalis petiolisque ad circa $\frac{1}{4}$ connatis integris prominete ferrugineo-punctatis; sepalis triangularibus acuminatis circa 1 mm. longis; petalis fere 2 mm. longis elliptico-oblongis acutiusculis; antheris exsertis subglobosis per rimas longas dehiscentibus, dorso filamentis affixis. — Peru: Mishuyacu, near Iquitos, in forest, (*Klug* 724, type, Field Museum; also 304; 1355).

The collector noted the color of the flowers for each specimen in the above order as « cream-color », « bright brown » and « brownish ». I think only one species is represented but the flowers of the last two numbers are smaller.

In habit the species is similar to *W. simplex* (Hook. f.) Mez, of the subgenus *Comomyrsine* with more compound inflorescence, scarcely connate sepals and few-punctate petals. Its petals, moreover, have nearly the form characterizing *Euweigeltia* in which group however, there seems to be no species similar.

Conomorpha dubia Macbr. spec. nov. — Frutex 2-3 m. altus; ramis virgatis glabratis; foliis definite subverticillatis ellipticis basi apiceque cuneato-acutis circa 1 dm. longis, 4-4.5 cm. latis, subcoriaceis, utrinque fere opacis, tenuiter denseque reticulato-nervulosis supra dense nigro-punctatis subtus praeter granulis brunneis dissitis glabris; petiolis 5-7 mm. longis; racemis 1.5-2.5 cm. longis pulverulentis, pedicellis vix 0,5 mm. longis; sepalis petiolisque 4 integerrimis conspicue pictis, sepalis basi connatis anguste ovato-acuminatis 1 mm. longis; petalis fere medium usque connatis circa 2 mm. longis oblongo-ovatis, margine undulatis, acutis; antheris epunctatis subovatis vel ovato-rotundatis dorso medio affixis; ovario punctato, stylo elongato. — Peru: Mishuyacu, near Iquitos (*Klug* 29906 type, Field Museum).

The fruit, not seen by me, is described by the collectors as « dull yellow ».

The shrub has the facies of a *Conomorpha* and finds an alliance, per-

haps, in the group of species containing *C. pastensis* Mez, but the anthers are scarcely typical, approaching, it seems to me, those of the genus *Weigeltia*.

Ardisia principis (A. DC.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Cybianthus principis* A. DC. in *Trans. Linn. Soc.* 17 : 104 (1834) = *Wallenia angustifolia* Nees & Mart. in *Nova Acta Acad. Nat. Cur.* 11 : 87 (1823) = *A. angustifolia* (Nees & Mart.) Mez in *Engl. Pflzr.* 236 : 94 (1902), not A. DC. *Prod.* 8 : 134 (1844).

Mez, l.c., erred in transferring the name of Nees and Martius for this species to *Ardisia* because its use was already preempted there by the presence of *A. angustifolia* A. DC. l. c. The correct name therefore for this plant is *A. principis* as indicated. *A. angustifolia* A. DC. has a synonym in *A. Candolleana* (Kth.) Mez, l. c. 138, as the former name is in conflict with no other and the suppression of it by Mez was uncalled for.

Diospyros myristicoides (Hiern) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Maba myristicoides* Hiern, *Monog. Ebenac.* 142 (1873).

Diospyros Pavonii (DC.) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Macreightia Pavonii* DC. *Prod.* 8 : 222 (1844) = *Maba Pavonii* (DC.) Hiern, *Monog. Ebenac.* 129 (1873).

Following R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink in *Gardens' Bull., Straits Settlements* 7 : 161-189 (1933) in his merger of *Maba* with *Diospyros* these species of the New World are to be transferred. I had already in manuscript for some time a note questioning the distinctness of *Maba*.

Spigelia Gilgii Macbr. nom. nov. = *S. nervosa* Gilg in *Bot. Jahrb.* 25 : 722 (1898), not Steud. in *Flora* 764 (1843).

This species originally collected by Sodiro in subtropical Ecuador is to be expected within Peru.

Justicia Lindeniana (Nees) Macbr. comb. nov. = *Rhytiglossa Lindeniana* Nees in DC. *Prod.* 11 : 349 (1847).

This is a *Justicia* in the sense the group is accepted at present. The type, from Mexico, is Linden 182, in herb. Hooker, which is represented also in the Prodrumus herb. and in herb. Moricand, now in herb. Delessert, Conservatoire Botanique.

Justicia Hochreutineri Macbr., nom. nov. = *Adhatoda Lindeniana* Nees in DC. *Prod.* 11 : 405 (1847), not *J. Lindeniana* (Nees) Macbr.

This species suggests the genus *Beloperone* but Lindau himself in herb. Delessert has referred the type number, Linden 1525, to *Justicia*, without, however, making the transfer. As the name *Lindeniana* may most properly be retained for the Mexican species cited above I change the name of this pretty white-flowered species of Venezuela and in appreciation of the work for botanical science of the Director of the Conservatoire Botanique, I give myself the pleasure of naming it in his honor. His name could fittingly be associated with many of the plants of the world in recognition of his impersonal work for the advancement of their study.