

stamens was uniform in one plant, different plants in the same population might have different numbers was checked by two methods: (1). The anther-bearing stamens were counted in one flower in each of ten plants in one collection (Oregon, *Leiberg* 240) of *P. Kelloggii* and all had three. The same count was made in two collections (Oregon, *Leiberg* 367; New Mexico, *Standley* 7632) of *P. Watsonii* and all had eight. (2). *P. Kelloggii* is very common in California but in the collections examined there were no plants with the same general aspect but with eight fertile stamens (*P. Watsonii*) from California. Likewise *P. Kelloggii* occurs in Nevada but no collections of *P. Watsonii* were seen from that state. *P. esotericum* occurs in California and has eight anther-bearing stamens but is readily distinguishable from *P. Kelloggii* by the slenderly cylindric inflorescence, white margins of the bracts, narrower achenes, and eight anther-bearing stamens; and from *P. Watsonii* by the characters already given in the key. Consequently there is both statistical and phytogeographic evidence that, while *P. Kelloggii* and *P. Watsonii* are often indistinguishable by habit and aspect, the difference in their numbers of fertile stamens is not due to either chance or vigor of the plants.

The two following species were published without designation of the precise specimen upon which they were based or the locality given was vague:

POLYGONUM MINIMUM S. Wats. in King, Rep. Geol. Expl. 40th Parallel 5: 315. 1871.

The TYPE, in Herb. Gray, came from Bear River Canyon, Uinta Mts., Utah, alt. 10,500 ft., Aug., 1869, *Sereno Watson* 1058.

POLYGONUM SHASTENSE Brewer in Proc. Am. Acad. 8: 400. 1873.

In view of the specific name it seems appropriate to take *Brewer* 1382 from Mt. Shasta, Siskiyou Co., California, as the type. *Brewer* gives the following data in his field-notebooks: "1382 Polygonum. A nearly prostrate shrub. 8000' to 9000' alt.—fls. rose, deepest on midvein of petal. Stam. 8—(number inconstant ?) Stig. 3-cleft." Sept. 13 (?), 1862, not 1863 as stated on printed label-heading.

VI. THALICTRUM POLYCARPUM S. WATS., A DISPUTED NAME

LOUIS C. WHEELER

There are two problems involved in this name: (1) What is the type? (2) Is the name available?

(1) *Thalictrum polycarpum* was published by Sereno Watson, Proc. Am. Acad. **14**: 288. 1879, in an article entitled: Descriptions of some new Species of North American Plants. In synonymy were cited: ". . . *T. Fendleri*, var. (?) *polycarpum*, Torr. in Pacif. R. Rep. 4. 61, in part. *T. Fendleri*, Brew. & Wats. Bot. Calif. 1.4, mainly." Watson's next reference to his species is Bot. Calif. **2**: 424. 1880, where he cites only the first synonym given above, again "in part." In the Synop. Fl. N. Am. **1**(1): 16. 1895, only the originally cited synonyms are given. In view of the fact that in no case did Watson state definitely on what part of *T. Fendleri* var. ? *polycarpum* his *T. polycarpum* was based and since he gave no indication of how he disposed of the remainder of the synonym, the species must, nomenclatorially, stand as Watson's solely rather than (Torr.) Watson. That means that the type must be sought at the Gray Herbarium. Davis, Minn. Bot. Studies, ser. 2, pt. **4**: 509-523. 1900 (Synonymic Conspectus of the Native and Garden *Thalictrums* of North America), does not consider the matter of types. The publication (by Torrey) in Pac. RR. Rep. **4**(5): 61. 1857, is as follows:

"*Thalictrum Fendleri*, Engelm. in Gray, Pl. Fendl. p. 5; var. ? *polycarpum*: glaberrimum; carpellis numerosioribus eglandulosis. Mountain ravines, New Mexico. In fruit October, &c. Sides of rivulets, Napa valley, California, April 25, (with immature fruit). It occurs in Coulter's California collection, in flower only . . ."

In *Plantae Fendlerianae* neither locality nor collection is cited for *Thalictrum Fendleri*. An examination of the specimens of *T. Fendleri* at the Gray Herbarium reveals that the species is evidently based on Fendler no. 13 in 1847 from New Mexico. Fendler's field notes (or a copy?) at the Gray Herbarium fail to elucidate matters. Someone, in the copy of the Pac. RR. Rep. 4 at the Gray Herbarium, has indicated that the New Mexican specimens belonged to *T. Fendleri*. But the field notes state: "Santa Fe, Creek-valley, shady places, margin of irrigating ditches at the foot of perpendic. rocks. 13th June-1st July in flower, 19th July in fruit". Since these data as to the type cannot be reconciled with "Mountain ravines, New Mexico. In fruit October, &c." there is no proof that there was any mistake made by Torrey, idem.

Watson applied *T. polycarpum* to a Californian entity and subsequent authors have followed him. The least confusion will be caused if the type chosen for *T. polycarpum* Wats. is the Napa Valley collection of Bigelow cited by Torrey under *T. Fendleri* var. ? *polycarpum*.

There is a specimen of this collection at the Gray Herbarium and I consider this the type of *T. polycarpum* Wats. An attempt was made to determine whether Torrey ever intended to apply the name *T. Fendleri* var. ? *polycarpum* to any New Mexican specimens. The folders of *T. Fendleri* and *polycarpum* at the New York Botanical Garden, where Torrey's herbarium is now kept, were examined. No specimens from New Mexico were labeled *T. Fendleri* var. ? *polycarpum*. But for that matter the Bigelow specimen from Napa Valley in 1853-4 was named only *T. Fendleri* Engelm. The Coulter specimen mentioned above was not found at New York. At the Gray Herbarium a sheet of the Bigelow collection is labeled *T. Fendleri* var. ? *polycarpum*. Also there is a staminate specimen collected by Coulter in California without date or number. This was originally labeled *T. Fendleri* but a later hand added *T. polycarpum*. It appears that Torrey may have sent his specimens to Asa Gray. Perhaps the Bigelow specimen at the Gray Herbarium should be considered the type of both *T. Fendleri* var. ? *polycarpum* Torrey and *T. polycarpum* Wats.

(2) Greene, *Muhlenbergia* 5: 128. 1909: "It is also now apparent that the name *T. polycarpum* is untenable. It had been chosen to designate an Old World member of the genus twenty years before Mr. Watson attempted to employ it. Since, then, the Watsonian type must be named anew, I shall take this occasion to give it a fuller description." The earlier *T. polycarpum* referred to by Greene was published by Loret, Bull. Soc. Bot. Fr. 6: 17. 1859, after describing the puzzling plant he was considering, in these words: "S'il m'était réservé de lui imposer un nom, je lui donnerais volontiers celui de *Th. polycarpum* ou mieux *multiflorum* . . ." Hence this is an illegitimate name of the type known as a *nomen provisorium*. Provisional names¹ are not only illegitimate but are not validly published.¹ Since they are not validly published they cannot, as earlier homonyms, invalidate a later name.² Lecoyer, Bull. Soc. Bot. Belg. 24: 78-324. 1885 (Monogr. *Thalictrum*), cites, p. 304, *T. polycarpum* Loret in synonymy and gives no adoption of the name by any other author. Hence *T. polycarpum* S. Watson is a valid name.

Greene, l. c., 129, published *T. ametrum* as a new name for *T. polycarpum* S. Watson. Jepson, *Flora Calif.* 1: 530. 1922, states, after

¹ See Zesde *Internat. Bot. Proc.* 1: 365. 1936; Sprague, *Jour. Bot.* 74: 75. 1936; & *Internat. Bot. Cong.* 1930 *Nomenclature Prop. Brit. Bot.*, 16-17, Art. 44. 1926, for discussion and examples.

² *Internat. Rules Bot. Nomencl. ed. 3, Art. 61.* 1935.

citing *T. ametrum* in synonymy, "type loc. seaward Coast Range." Evidently this was done under the misapprehension that *T. ametrum* was a new species rather than a new name.

VII. THE TYPE OF THE GENUS *LEPIDOSPARTUM*

LOUIS C. WHEELER

The type species of *Lepidospartum* A. Gray is *Lynosyris squamata* A. Gray since, when the genus *Lepidospartum* was described, this was the only species assigned to it. So far there is no problem. What specimen should be taken as the type of the species is, however, something of a puzzle. Gray had only two specimens at the time he described it. This is evidenced by the fact that there are in the Gray Herbarium only two sheets bearing respectively the names *Linosyris squamata* var. *Breweri* and *L. s.* var. *Palmeri*; all other sheets bear collection dates later than 1870, the year in which Gray described the two above varieties. To have designated two varieties from only two specimens leaves nothing as the type of the species according to our present ideas of proper typification. Gray himself seems to have given no hint of which element he considered the more typical. In no case that I can find did he reduce one variety to synonymy and maintain the other. In Syn. Fl. N. Am. 1(1): 378. 1884, he abandoned both varieties simultaneously, concluding that they "are mere varying forms." Abrams, Bull. N. Y. Bot. Gard. 6: 482. 1910 (Phyteographic & Taxonomic Study S. Calif. Trees & Shrubs), concludes that "We are therefore obliged to consider the Brewer plant as the type of the species, reducing the varietal name to synonymy." Evidently Abrams made his choice arbitrarily by priority of position as required by the now passé American Code. The International Rules provide that in the case of simultaneously published synonymous names, the author who first reduces one to a synonym of the other thereby determines which shall be used. This case of reduction by Abrams is unfortunately not quite parallel since he, idem, in his next sentence, reduced var. *Palmeri*: "The desert form, *Palmeri* does not seem distinct." It seems expedient to apply the unqualified specific name to the widespread entity. Therefore the Brewer specimen which represents this is taken as the type of the species *squamatum* which is the type of the genus *Lepidospartum*.

It is usual in modern monographic studies to designate by "var.



Wheeler, Louis C. 1938. "Thalictrum polycarpum S. Wats., a disputed name." *Contributions from the Gray Herbarium of Harvard University* (122), 317–320.
<https://doi.org/10.5962/p.336206>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/123814>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/p.336206>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/336206>

Holding Institution

Missouri Botanical Garden, Peter H. Raven Library

Sponsored by

Missouri Botanical Garden

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Permission to digitize granted by rights holder

Rights Holder: Harvard University Herbaria

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