

P. incanum var. *oblongum* Fourn. Mex. Pl. i. 83 (1872). This was founded on *P. incanoides* Fée and must remain similarly uncertain.

P. mesetae Christ in Bull. Herb. Boiss: ser. 2, vi. 49 (1906). Maxon places this species in the synonymy of *P. polypodioides*. I have not seen the type, Alfaro 16907 from Costa Rica; but Christ's description of the rhizome-scales as "brunneis, setaceis, strigillosis" and of the stipes as setulose below suggests some other species.

I realize that it is by no means impossible that some of the names here rejected as doubtful may prove to apply to one or both of the varieties described as new. Only actual examination of the types concerned can settle that; and it may be a very long time before such examination is possible, if ever. Less confusion will result from putting forward a new name of definite application which may later have to be abandoned than from taking up an old one in the wrong sense.

7. A MISCELLANY OF NEW WORLD EUPHORBIACEAE.

BY LOUIS CUTTER WHEELER.

The identity and nomenclature of sundry New World Euphorbiaceae and alleged Euphorbiaceae are herein discussed. Material for this study has been borrowed from Field Museum, Chicago; Pomona College, Claremont, California; University of California, Berkeley; and U. S. National Herbarium. The writer hereby expresses his gratitude to the curators of these institutions for their kindness in loaning essential specimens.

HIERONYMA FENDLERI Briquet in Ann. Cons. Jard. Bot. Genève 4: 227. 1900. The reduction of this to a variety of *H. Moritziana* (Muell. Arg.) Pax & Hoffmann, Pflanzenreich IV. 147(15): 33. 1922 (based on *H. macrocarpa* α *Moritziana* Muell. Arg., Linnaea 34: 66. 1865), by Pax & Hoffmann, idem, is contrary to the rules of priority (Rules, Art. 16). If these two entities are but varietally distinct the reduction should be reversed.

PHYLLANTHUS NOBILIS (L. f.) Muell. Arg., DC. Prod. 15(2): 414. 1866; based on *Margaritaria nobilis* L. f., Suppl. Pl., 428. 1781, as to the female plant only. According to Muell. Arg., idem, the male plant was Combretacea. Consequently, under Article 64 of the Rules, this name must be abandoned:

"Art. 64. A name of a taxonomic group must be rejected if the characters of that group were derived from two or more entirely discordant elements, especially if those elements were erroneously sup-

posed to form part of the same individual. A list of the names to be abandoned for this reason (*Nomina confusa*) will form Appendix V."

The name to be applied to this concept is, according to the synonymy given by Muell. Arg., *Phyllanthus antillanus* (Adr. Jussieu) Muell. Arg., *Linnaea* **32**: 51. 1863; based on *Cicca antillana* Adr. Jussieu, *Euphorb. Gen. Tent.* 108, Pl. 4, fig. 13B. 1824.

PHYLLANTHUS VIRIDIS M. E. Jones, Extracts from *Contrib. West. Bot.* **18**: 47. 1933; based on *M. E. Jones 27503*, Oct. 2, 1930, Caca-chilla Mountains, Lower California, Mexico (Pomona College No. 191590 type; Gray Herb. isotype). The type of this is a good match for the type of *Colubrina glabra* S. Wats., *Proc. Am. Acad.* **24**: 44. 1889: *Ed. Palmer 200 in 1887*, Guaymas, Sonora, Mexico (Gray Herb.).

CROTON CRENULATUS M. E. Jones, Extracts from *Contr. West. Bot.* **18**: 48. 1933. Type: Cayuca Ranch, Loreto, Lower California, Oct. 23, 1930, *M. E. Jones 27499* (Pomona College Herbarium No. 191581; duplicate in Gray Herbarium). This is a *Bernardia* and seems best referable to *B. mexicana* (H. & A.) Muell. Arg. var. *genuina* Muell. Arg. for the present. It may prove to be varietally distinct. Both Pax, *Pflanzenreich*, IV. **147(7)**: 24. 1914, and Standley, *Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb.* **23**: 633. 1923 (*Trees and Shrubs Mex.*) cite *B. Brandegei* Millsp., *Proc. Cal. Acad.*, ser. 2, **3**: 172. 1891, in synonymy under *B. mexicana*. The type of Millspaugh's *nomen nudum* came from San José del Cabo (the tip of Lower California). In spite of this, neither Pax nor Standley gives the range of *B. mexicana* as other than southeastern Mexico and southward.

CROTON PALMERI S. Watson var. *OVALIS* Fernald, *Proc. Amer. Acad.* **36**: 493. 1901 (Apr.). An examination of the type (hb. Gray) reveals that this is identical with *C. leucophyllus* Muell. Arg. var. *trisepalis* Ferguson, *Rep. Mo. Bot. Gard.* **12**: 57. 1901 (Feb.). This well-marked variety is represented in Gray Herbarium by the following four collections all of which are from Monterey, Nuevo Leon, Mexico: *Pringle 11163* (distributed as *C. Lindheimerianus* Scheele); *G. Arsène 6318* (*Bro. Abbon 151*); *Pringle 2225* (distributed as *C. capitatus* Michx.); *C. & E. Seler 1047* (type of *C. Palmeri* var. *ovalis*).

There is in Gray Herbarium a specimen of this variety purporting to have come from Brazil. It was distributed as a *forma* (under a geographical name based on "Brasil" and attributed to Muell. Arg. but apparently unpublished) of *Croton capitatus* Michaux. The collector's name is illegible. The label is the large (ca. $5\frac{1}{4} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$ inch) black-framed label similar to that described by Standley, *Science* n. s. **65**:

130-133. 1927, which was distributed in fake sets; but in this case the plants were originally from Mexico and falsely from Brazil which is the reverse of the later situation exposed by Standley. The heading of the label is "Plantae Brasiliae et Indiae occidentalis." The "Ind. occ." was crossed out. The great similarity of aspect of the two specimens makes it appear that the plants allegedly from Brazil were really from Monterey, Nuevo Leon, *G. Arsène 6318 (Abbon 151)*.

CROTON TRAGIOIDES Blake in Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. **24**: 12. 1922. Type: Shore of Lake Izabal, Dept. Izabal, Guatemala, *S. F. Blake 7854* (U. S. Nat. Herb. No. 989621!). The type differs in no way from the common tropical American weed *Croton trinitatis* Millsp. in Field Mus. Pub. Bot. **2**: 57. 1900; based on *Croton chamaedryfolius* Lam. *sensu* Griseb., Fl. Brit. W. I., 41. 1859. The name cannot be based on *Geiseleria chamaedryfolia* (Lam.) Klotzsch in Hooker, Journ. Bot. **2**: 47. 1843, for Klotzsch gave no diagnosis and based his name directly on *Croton chamaedryfolium* [original spelling] Lam., Encyc. Meth. Bot. **2**: 215. 1786. *Croton Miquelensis* Ferguson, Rep. Mo. Bot. Gard. **12**: 48. 1901 (corrected? to "*Miquelianus*" by Lanjouw in Pulle, Fl. Surinam **2**: 38. 1932) has exactly the same basis as *Croton trinitatis* Millsp. It is well to explain that Mueller Argovensis, DC. Prod. **15**(2): 879. 1866, transferred *Croton chamaedryfolium* Lam. to *Acalypha* and that disposition is accepted by F. Pax & K. Hoffmann, Pflanzenreich IV. **147**(16): 29. 1924. At the same time Mueller (p. 686) continued to use *Croton chamaedryfolius sensu* Griseb. in order to perpetuate the name in the established sense under *Croton*. Such a procedure is now considered untenable either under the homonym rule (Art. 61), or under the rule prohibiting continued use of a name after its type has been removed (Art. 18).

CROTON Wigginsii nom. nov.; based on *Croton arenicola* Rose & Standley in Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. **16**: 12. 1912, not Small in Bull. N. Y. Bot. Gard. **3**: 428. 1905.

The type: Sandhills, Adair Bay, Sonora, Mexico, Nov. 20, 1908, *G. Sykes 62* (U. S. Nat. Herb. 574267) is before me. It seems to be quite distinct by the larger seeds from its closest relative, *Croton californicus* Muell. Arg. and its variants. This collection of Sykes is the only one known to me. Perhaps the species will be re-collected when someone else has the hardihood to visit Adair Bay and make a collection of the plants. It is a pleasure to associate the name of Dr. Ira L. Wiggins, who is now studying the flora of the Sonoran Desert, with one of the rarities of that area.

Since the above was set in type a second collection of *Croton Wig-*

ginsii has transpired, to wit: Algodones Sand Hills one mile east of Gray's Well on U. S. Highway No. 80, Imperial County, California, May 17, 1938, R. S. Ferris & R. P. Rossbach 9584 (Gray Herb.).

CROTON SITIENS T. S. Brandegee, Univ. Calif. Pub. Bot. 10: 185. 1922. Based on *C. A. Purpus* 8732, April, 1922, Remulatero, Vera Cruz, Mexico (Univ. Calif., type; Gray Herb.). Type seen! This is identical with *Ditaxis tinctoria* (Millsp.) Pax & Hoffm., Pflanzenreich IV. 147(6): 59. 1912, based on *Argythamnia tinctoria* Millsp., Field Mus. Pub. Bot. 1: 302. 1896. Type: G. F. Gaumer 426 in 1895, Yucatan (Field Mus. no. 36229!). The statement by Millspaugh, l. c., 285, "Plants collected by Dr. George F. Gaumer in 1885, . . ." seems to contradict the date "1895" printed on the label but the number 426 agrees and Millspaugh marked the sheet "Type," so type it is. Many of the leaves of Millspaugh's type are large (to 7.5 cm. long) and glabrous above, while the leaves of *Purpus* 8732 are mostly not over 3 cm. long and vestite above. But Gaumer 1045 from Yucatan (Field Mus.) has large leaves agreeing with Gaumer 426 in lack of vestiture on the upper surface but also smaller ones clothed on both sides essentially as *Purpus* 8732. The *Purpus* plant appears to have suffered from lack of moisture. *D. tinctoria* is doubtfully distinct from *D. guatemalensis* (Muell. Arg.) Pax & Hoffm.

EREMOCARPUS Benth. Since my recent defense (Madroño 4: 272-273. 1938) of the nomenclatorial validity of this genus, further corroborative evidence has been discovered: Post & Kuntze, Lexicon Gen. Phaner., 201. 1904, give "Eremocarpus" Lindley as equaling *Eremodaucus* and "Eremocarpus" Reichenbach as equaling *Eremosporus*. I had independently arrived at the same conclusion.

There is a curious error in literature as to the number of species in this genus. It were well to correct it before it gains general credence from much repetition. Only one species is accepted in the genus and only one has been validly published. However, F. Pax in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 3(5): 41. 1890, states "2 Arten, *E. setigerus* Benth. (Fig. 26 E) und *tenuis* Watson, im pacifischen Nordamerika, an sandigen Standorten, namentlich in der Nähe der Küste." Evidently following this statement, Post & Kuntze, Lexicon Gen. Phaner., 201. 1904 state that *Eremocarpus* Benth. has 2 species in California. Later the error was repeated in more convincing form by F. Pax & K. Hoffmann in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam., 2 Aufl., 19c: 88. 1931: "*E. setigerus* Benth. (Fig. 43 E) und *E. tenuis* Watson im pazifischen Nordamerika an sandigen Stellen, meist an der Küste." The psychological basis of this *nomen nudum* is perhaps *Croton tenuis*

S. Watson, but it probably has no biological basis and doubtless arose by some lapse.

DITAXIS polygama (Jacquin) comb. nov. *Croton polygamum* Jacquin, Enum. Syst. Pl. Carib., 32. 1762; Select. Stirp. Amer., 255. 1763; not Geiseler, 1807. *Argythamnia polygama* (Jacq.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. 2: 593. 1891. Muell. Arg., DC. Prod. 15(2): 736. 1866, O. Kuntze, idem, and Pax, Pflanzenreich IV. 147(6): 55. 1912, all agree that this name is the earliest applicable to *Ditaxis lancifolia* Schlecht. in Linnaea 26: 635. 1853. The earlier name was rejected, except by Kuntze, on the ground that it was incongruous.

DITAXIS malpighipila (Hicken) comb. nov. *Croton? malpighipilus* Hicken, Physis 2: 106. 1916. Hicken had pistillate specimens only. The species is dioecious and it is difficult to distinguish *Croton* from *Ditaxis* without staminate flowers. However, the malpighiaceae character of the vestiture should have suggested *Ditaxis*. The isotype in Gray Herbarium is staminate. The staminate flowers will be described here to complete Hicken's description: Staminate flowers ca. 3.5 mm. long, solitary in the axils; pedicels ca. 1.5 mm. long, with appressed malpighiaceae hairs; calyx clothed as the pedicel without, glabrous within, round, slenderly obconical, tapering to the pedicel, deeply five-parted, segments ovate-lanceolate; petals 5, glabrous, spatulate, entire, 4 mm. long, slightly exceeding the sepals; glands adnate to the column; stamens 10, in two verticils of 5 each, verticils approximate; staminodia 5, slender, strongly papillate.

This plant seems to belong to *Ditaxis* sect. *Anacanthium* Baill. as defined by Pax, Pflanzenreich IV. 147(6): 58. 1912. The following key will separate it from its nearest relative:

Leaves 1.6–2 cm. long, denticulate; ♀ petals about equaling the calyx.	<i>D. breviramea</i> (Muell Arg.) Pax & K. Hoffm.
Leaves 5–7 mm. long, entire; ♀ petals twice as long as the calyx.	<i>D. malpighipila</i> .

Walter Fischer, collector of the type, has made a list of corrections for *Plantae Fischerianae* (Hicken, Physis 2: 1–18. 1915, 2: 101–122. 1916). This unpublished list of corrections, deposited at the Gray Herbarium, gives the following notes that are pertinent here:

"Page 2 Pl. Fisch. Paragraph 2 in section under "Ovservaciones," line 1, "habitat";—The author [Hicken] credits the collector with the notes on the habitat of the plants, but in very many instances they are his own; as an example: No. 139. (F. 190), a plant undoubtedly never seen in its native habitat by anyone save the collector, is incorrectly put down as found among conglomerates, whereas it is

very characteristic of this plant to grow only in the soft chalk-like formation of the bluffs on both sides of the river; . . .” Fischer no. 190 is the type collection of *Ditaxis malpighipila*.

ARGYTHAMNIA P. Browne, Hist. Jamaica, 338. 1756. Many authors have refused to accept this generic name as validly published by P. Browne. There seems to be no reason for rejecting Browne’s attempt as ineffective publication for under the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, Article 43 “The name of a monotypic new genus based on a new species is validated: (1) by the provision of a combined generic and specific description (*descriptio generico-specifica*), or (2) . . .”. Such a description was provided by Browne. Perhaps some workers considered this a unitary designation of a species but it is not since, though *Argythamnia* was assigned but one species, that species is given, under a polynomial, in a fashion exactly parallel to *Urtica* (pp. 336–338) to which eleven species are assigned. Pax & Hoffmann in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfamilien, 2 Aufl., 19c: 94. 1931, refused to accept Browne’s publication and cited “*Argithamnia* Sw. Prodr. (1788) 39.” In the first place Swartz spelled it “*Argythamnia*” as did Browne, and, in the second place, if they refused to accept Browne’s publication they should have taken C. G. Ludwig’s publication in his posthumous Def. Gen. Pl., 434. 1760 (edited by Boehmer).

It appeared that *Ditaxis Brandegei* threatened the distinction between *Argythamnia* and *Ditaxis* in that it was described as having but one whorl of stamens. But, as noted under the discussion of *Sebastiana sarmentosa* Jones, Millspaugh erred in so describing his species and *Ditaxis* has always two whorls of stamens as contrasted with but one in *Argythamnia*.

BERNARDIA MAZATLANA M. E. Jones, Extracts from Contrib. West. Bot. 18: 49. 1933; based on *M. E. Jones 22626*, Nov. 20, 1926, Mazatlan, Sinaloa, Mexico. Type in Herb. Pomona College, not seen. Isotype in Herb. Gray! This is identical with *Acalypha microphylla* Klotzsch in Seemann, Bot. Voy. Herald, 278. 1856,¹ type locality Mazatlan. In Gray Herbarium is a probable isotype bearing only the data: “N. W. Mex. Seemann.” Pax & K. Hoffmann, Pflanzenreich IV. 147(17): 30. 1924, refer *A. microphylla* doubtfully to *A. chamaedrifolia* (Lam.) Muell. Arg., a species of the West Indies and tropical Florida. Besides the supposed isotype, *A. microphylla* is represented in Gray Herbarium by five other collections all of which are from the west coast of Mexico from Altata, Sinaloa, south

¹ See Sprague, Journ. Bot. 59: 22–23. 1921 for date.

to Colima: Sinaloa: Altata, *T. S. Brandegee*, Sept. 2, 1904; Mazatlan, *W. G. Wright* 1227, *M. E. Jones* 22626. Colima: Colima, *Ed. Palmer* 1251 in 1891, p. p.; Manzanillo, *Ed. Palmer* 935 in 1890. Phytogeographic considerations would cast doubt on the supposed identity of the two species and they do appear fairly distinct. *A. microphylla* has, on the average, longer pistillate spikes bearing, in many cases, a terminal flower on a pedicel as much as 1 cm. long. The frequent absence of this terminal flower in fruiting specimens may be due to its having been broken. *A. chamaedrifolia* has shorter spikes without the terminal pedicellate flower and the terminal spikes are often androgynous.

ACALYPHA SANTAE-MARTAE Pax & Hoffmann, *Pflanzenreich* IV. 147(16): 121. 1924, is based on the same collection, *H. H. Smith* 429, as *A. asterifolia* Rusby, *Descr. 300 New Species So. Am. Pl.*, 48. 1920, which is the earlier name. Pax & Hoffmann overlooked five other species of *Acalypha* published by Rusby in the same work. Oddly enough Rusby, l. c. 47, published *A. Williamsii* based on *R. S. Williams* 655 overlooking his earlier publication, *Bull. N. Y. Bot. Gard.* 8: 101. 1912, under the same name of what seems to be a different plant based on *H. H. Smith* 656 from the same locality as Williams' collection.

ACALYPHA YUCATANENSE Millsp., *Field Mus. Pub. Bot.* 1: 371. 1898, based on *Gaumer* 1176 from Progreso, Yucatan. An apparent fragment of the type, and an isotype are in Gray Herbarium. Pax and K. Hoffmann, *Pflanzenreich* IV. 147(16): 176. 1924 include this name in the list of species not identified, yet, in the list of exsiccatae, they cite *Gaumer* 1176 as *A. yucatanensis* (corrected gender). *A. yucatanensis* Millsp. is *A. Poiretii*.

SEBASTIANIA SARMENTOSA M. E. Jones, *Extracts from Contr. West Bot.* 18: 49. 1933. Type: Primera Agua, near Loreto, Lower California, Oct. 19 [on label, published as 15] 1930, *M. E. Jones* 27544, Pomona College Herbarium (not seen). Isotype (seen) at Gray Herbarium. Jones also cites "and near Loreto no. 27545." I suspect this is a number error (unless I have misread his wretched writing) for he distributed under this name from Mountain east of Loreto, Oct. 17, 1930, *M. E. Jones* 27543 (Pomona, Gray). Both collections are *Ditaxis Brandegei* (Millsp.) Rose & Standley.

Millspaugh, *Proc. Calif. Acad. Sci.* II 2: 220. 1889, in describing *Argythamnia Brandegei* stated: "stamens 5, in a whorl near the summit of the column of filaments which is terminated by a few rudiments of stamens." Examination of an isotype in Gray Herbarium reveals

that in actual fact there are ten fertile stamens in two whorls of five each and five minute staminodia. Likewise *Jones* 27543, cited above, has the same number. Pax, *Pflanzenreich* IV. 147(6): 69 & 72. 1912, also gives the number of stamens as five. It appears that Pax saw no specimens of the species for his description is a mere latinization of Millspaugh's original description.

EUPHORBIA **Howellii** nom. nov.; based on *E. diffusa* Hooker f. in *Trans. Linn. Soc.* 20: 184. 1847, not Jacq., *Misc. Austr. Bot. Chem. and Hist. Nat.* 2: 311. 1781.

It is a pleasure to name this species for Mr. John Thomas Howell, and thus commemorate a name so closely identified with the flora of the Galapagos Islands by applying the name to a member of that flora.

PEDILANTHUS laurocerasifolius (Miller) comb. nov.; based on *Tithymalus lauro-cerasifolius* Miller, *Gard. Dict.* ed. 8. *Tithymalus* No. 2. 1768. This species was described from cultivated plants. If any specimens of Miller's plants are extant the type will be chosen from them. Otherwise the species will have to rest on the Dillenian specimens of *Tithymaloides laurocerasifolio non serrato*, Dillenius, *Hortus Elthamensis* 2: 383-4, T. CCLXXVII, F. 372. 1732, which are said to be extant. If these specimens cannot be found the Dillenian plate will have to serve as the principal means of identifying the species. The above-cited Dillenian description and plate and the specimens of the plants, if extant, are the basis of *Euphorbia Tithymaloides* β *padifolia* L., *Sp. Pl.* 1: 453. 1753. Judging by the common identity of the polynomials cited under both names it is highly probable that *Euphorbia Tithymaloides* L. β *padifolia* L. and *Tithymalus laurocerasifolius* Miller are identical. This was also the conclusion of Haworth, *Syn. Pl. Succ.*, 136. 1812.—*Pedilanthus padifolius* (L.) Poiteau in *Ann. Mus. D'Hist. Nat. Paris* 19: 393. 1812 was really based on *Euphorbia Tithymaloides* β *padifolia* L. even though Poiteau cited "*Euphorbia padifolia*, Willd., sp. pl. tom. 2, p. 891" as the source. Examination of this reference shows that though Willdenow did have this binomial he had it as var. β which is, of course, Linnaeus'. Hence the authors of *Tithymalus padifolius* are (L.) Croizat, not (Willd.) Croizat.



Wheeler, Louis C. 1939. "A miscellany of New World Euphorbiaceae."
Contributions from the Gray Herbarium of Harvard University (124), 35–42.
<https://doi.org/10.5962/p.336218>.

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

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/p.336218>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/336218>

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>.