

rated from *L. Fremontii* by the absence of inner chaff, and the presence of black stipitate glands.

*LAYIA GLANDULOSA* (Hook.) Hook. et Arn. subsp. *typica* nom. nov.—*Blepharipappus glandulosus* Hook. Fl. Bor. Am. 1: 316, 1833. *Layia glandulosus* Hook. et Arn. Bot. Beech. 358, 1838. This is the most polymorphic species of the genus, with an extensive range from British Columbia southward to Lower California and Arizona. Although variation extends to all parts of the plant, recombinations of the various characters are so frequent as to permit the proposal of but one segregate subspecies at present.

*LAYIA GLANDULOSA* subsp. *lutea* subsp. nov. Corollae radii et disci luteae.

Restricted to San Benito County, California, where it is frequent. *Type*: Bear Valley, north of Pinnacles post office, May 1, 1933, *Keck 2017* (Dudley Herb.). Isotypes to be distributed.

This subspecies, with golden-yellow flowers, breaks down the universally applied key character of flower-color for *L. glandulosa*, but this had already become inevitable by the discovery of white forms assignable to the yellow *L. pentachaeta*. *Layia glandulosa* is distinguished by the ten broad pappus bristles, hispid pubescence, for the most part entire leaves and incidentally, by its almost universal occurrence on sandy soil.

Carnegie Institution of Washington.  
Stanford University, October 30, 1934.

### CRITICAL NOTES ON ERIOPHYLLUM LAG.—III

LINCOLN CONSTANCE

#### The misinterpretation of *Bahia leucophylla* DC.

Perhaps no specific name applicable to a member of the genus *Eriophyllum* has been more diversely and erroneously interpreted than that of *Bahia leucophylla* of de Candolle. The original material was collected (cf. Prodr. 5: 657. 1836) by "Nee et Haenke," at "Nootka et Mullgrave" (Malaspina Expedition, 1791).

The specific name (as "leucophyllum") has been subsequently recombined as follows: *Eriophyllum caespitosum* var. *leucophyllum* Gray (Proc. Am. Acad. 19: 26. 1883), *Eriophyllum leucophyllum* Rydb. (Mem. N. Y. Bot. Gard. 1: 422. 1900), *Eriophyllum leucophyllum* Howell (Fl. N. W. Am. 1: 355. 1903), and *Eriophyllum lanatum* var. *leucophyllum* Carter et al. (Prel. Cat. Fl. Vancouver and Queen Charlotte isls., Prov. Mus., Victoria, B. C., 82. 1921).

Although still including (in most cases) the original collection, the name was so twisted or amplified as to embrace also one or more of the following phases of *Eriophyllum lanatum* var. *integrifolium* (Hook.) Smiley:



1. Rocky Mountain phase (*Trichophyllum integrifolium* Hook. *Trichophyllum multiflorum* Nutt. etc.): Walp. Rept. Bot. Syst. 6: 175. 1846-7; Torr. et Gray, Fl. N. Am. 2: 375. 1841-3; Hook. Lond. Jour. Bot. 6: 248. 1847; Porter, U. S. G. S. Terrs., Prel. Rept. pt. 4, 486. 1871; Coulter, U. S. G. S. Terrs. 6<sup>3</sup>: 770. 1873; Parry, Am. Nat. 8: 13. 1874; Rydb. l. c.

2. Walla Walla Plateau phase (This has not, I believe, been specifically segregated): Gray, Proc. Am. Acad. 19: 26. 1883; Howell, l. c.; Rydb. l. c.

3. Great Basin and Harney Plateau phase (*Eriophyllum Watsoni* Gray, *Eriophyllum trichocarpum* Rydb.): Eaton, in Wats. U. S. G. Expl. 40 Par. 17. 1871; Anderson, Nev. Min. Bien. Rept. 1869-70, 122. 1871; Rothrock, U. S. G. S. w. 100 Par. 6: 167. 1878.

4. High Sierra Nevada phase (*Eriophyllum lutescens* and *monoense* Rydb. *Eriophyllum nevadense* Gdgr. etc.): Bolander, Enum. Pl. 1866, 11. 1867.

The writer endeavored to obtain material from the two type localities: Nootka (western Vancouver Island) and Mullgrave (Yakutat Bay, Alaska). No authentic record of the occurrence or collection of *Eriophyllum* in Alaska was obtainable. An examination of representatives of the genus (from the Provincial Museum, Victoria, B. C., and the National Museum of Canada, Ottawa) collected on Vancouver Island, revealed none which could not be referred to typical *Eriophyllum lanatum* (Pursh) Forbes (*Eriophyllum caespitosum* Dougl.).

I have recently received from the Conservatoire Botanique de la Ville de Geneve a photograph of at least part of the original collection, bearing the data mentioned above. Although the original material is of specimens somewhat smaller than ordinary, with fewer-flowered heads, the leaves slightly more tomentose, and their pinnation partially suppressed, the writer experiences no doubt in assigning the material to typical *Eriophyllum lanatum*. The specimens, it is thought, are dwarfed individuals from an ecologically unfavorable habitat, exhibiting appropriate modifications. The leaves, involucres, and geographical occurrence all demonstrate the correctness of this determination.

The pappus, which was described as consisting of four lanceolate acute paleae alternating with four shorter obtuse ones, was believed to be distinctive, but, in view of the variability of this structure throughout the species and even the genus, this distinction can scarcely be maintained. This removes the last character of supposedly specific or varietal value.

*Bahia leucophylla* DC., then, becomes a synonym of *Eriophyllum lanatum* (Pursh) Forbes, a disposal which should conclude almost a century of successive misinterpretations.

University of California, Berkeley,  
January, 1934.



Constance, Lincoln. 1935. "CRITICAL NOTES ON ERIOPHYLLUM LAG.— III."  
*Madroño; a West American journal of botany* 3, 18–19.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/185502>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/169568>

**Holding Institution**

Smithsonian Libraries and Archives

**Sponsored by**

Biodiversity Heritage Library

**Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: In Copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder

Rights Holder: California Botanical Society

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>

Rights: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions/>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.