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The following list gives the names of the members who forwarded specimens for distribution, and the number contributed by each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Counted as Specimens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Bailey, F.L.S.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Craig-Christie, F.L.S.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. H. Beeby, A.L.S.</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Arthur Bennett, F.L.S.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. T. R. A. Briggs, F.L.S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. Bromwich</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eyre de Crespinigny</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. G. C. Druce, M.A., F.L.S.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. H. E. Fox, M.A.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Fraser, M.A.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alfred Fryer</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. J. Geldart</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John E. Griffith, F.R.A.S.</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Augustin Ley, M.A.</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. E. F. Linton, M.A.</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. W. K. Linton, M.A.</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. E. A. Lomax</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Counted as Specimens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Cosmo Melvill, M.A., F.L.S.</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. F. T. Mott, F.R.G.S.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Geo. Nicholson, A.L.S.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. W. H. Painter</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. W. H. Purchas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. W. Reeves</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. W. Mayle Rogers, F.L.S.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. W. Seulny, F.L.S.</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. H. A. Stuart</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. S. A. Stewart</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss R. F. Thompson</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. F. Townrow</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. W. White, F.L.S.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The thanks of the Club are specially due to the following experts:
Professor Fr. Crépin, Rosa; Prof. Babington and Dr. Focke, Rubi; Abbé Stral, Mentha; Professor Hackel, Gramineae; Dr. F. Buchanan-White, Salices; Mr. F. J. Hanbury, Hieracia; Professor Haussknecht and Monsieur W. Babey, Epilobia; Dr. Engler, Saxifragae; Dr. Schönland, Campanula; Prof. Alfred Bennett, Polygala.

Besides the gentlemen mentioned above, the distributor has received assistance from many specially interested in British Botany; he believes the names of all these occur in the body of the Report. Mr. Arthur Bennett has been kind enough to indicate the new County records in the plants contributed, additional to 'Topographical Botany,' ed. 2.
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Thalictrum minus, L., var. dunense, Dumort. Sandhills, Armadale, and Melvich, also near Betty Hill, Sutherland, July, 1888.—J. C. MELVILL.

—Arth. Bennett.
Thalictrum minus, L., var. (calcareum, Jord.). Ben Bulben, Sligo, 17th August, 1885.—W. R. LINTON. “Correct.”—J. G. Baker. The leaflets are much narrower than those of the preceding plant.—Ed.

Anemone ranunculoides, L. Naturalised in Calverton Park, Bucks, April, 1878.—G. CLARIDGE DRUCE.

Ranunculus fluitans, Lamk., form. Brailsford, S. Derby, September, 1880. This plant is very plentiful in Brailsford Brook, mostly producing no floating leaves, but in one spot producing them rather freely. The receptacle is not glabrous, and, I should have said, is more than glabrescent.—W. R. LINTON. “R. fluitans, form.”—H. Groves. “I should have doubted the correctness of this name much.”—Arth. Bennett. “It seems to be penicillatus. Is not the receptacle hispid?”—C. C. Babington.

R. elongatus, F. Schultz; or, R. aquatilis, L., var. (?) elongatus, F. Sch. Ditch, roadside, in somewhat brackish water, Canvey Island, Essex, 1888. If so, hardly, perhaps, typical; stems very long and tapering; petals, though larger than those of trichophyllus, are smaller than those of any form of peltatus, floating leaves tripartite —Eyre de Crespiigny. “R. Baudotii?”—Ed. “Is R. Baudotii?”—J. Groves.

R. hederaceus, L., form. Near Ashbourne, Derbyshire, 13th July, 1888. This, Messrs. Groves consider is not R. omiophyllus, Ten. It is a remarkably large and stout growing form, which feature may possibly have been aggravated by the wetness of last season.—W. R. LINTON. Prof. Babington would cross out the omiophyllus, and call it simply hederaceus.

R. acris, L., var. pumilus, Wahl. Corrie Sneachda, Easterness, August, 1887 and 1888.—G. C. Druce. Previously recorded from the Dovrefjeld; see Ahlberg’s specimens in British Museum and Herb. Oxon; and from the Faroe Islands.—Ed.


Caltha palustris, L., form. Bradley, S. Derbyshire, 16th June, 1888. This species in this neighbourhood presents considerable variety in the length of the beak of its fruit. I send a few plants showing long-beaked fruit; there is no other noticeable variation accompanying this point that I can see.—W. R. LINTON. Prof. Babington would have liked to have seen the lower leaves.


Epimedium alpinum, L. Calverton Park, Bucks, May, 1878.—G. CLARIDGE Druce.

Nymphaea pumila, Hoffm., Nuphar minimum, Sm. Loch Avinlochy, Easterness, July, 1887.—G. C. Druce. This was first described in E. B., by Smith, as Nuphar minimum; but subsequently discovering that Hoffmann had described it as Nymphaea pumila, he changed the name in the ‘English Flora’ to Nuphar pumilum. If Salisbury’s genus Castalia be adopted for Nymphaea, Hoffmann’s name of Nymphaea pumila is the name this plant must bear. If Smith’s arrangement be retained, then his E. B. name of Nuphar minimum will have priority.—Ed.
Papaver Rheas, L., var. Pryorii, mihi. Culham, Berks, June, 1888, G. C. DRUCE. In the ‘Flora of Oxfordshire,’ p. 18, I drew attention to the occurrence of a form with red hairs on the peduncles, which I had long noticed not only in Oxon but in several other midland counties. It is readily distinguished from the type by its peduncles, especially the upper portion, being covered with crimson hairs. This character is best seen before the flowers expand. As a similar form is noted in the (posthumous) ‘Flora of Herts,’ I should like the form, which I had in MS. called ruficaulis, to bear the name of the talented author of that work, to whose extensive knowledge of botanical literature and critical discrimination we are all indebted.—Ed.

P. dubium, L., var. Railway bank, Milverton, Warwickshire, July, 1888.—H. BROMWICH. “Is P. Rheas, var. levigatum, not dubium?”—J. G. Baker. In the ‘Prodromus’ there is included a Caucasian plant, P. levigatum, M. Bieb., which Marshall a Bieberstein first described in ‘Fl. Tr. Cauc.,’ vol. iii. 364 (1819), as “P. capsulis oblongis calycibusque glabris, caule multifloro setis rarisimis subhispidis, foliis pinnatifidis incisis subpilosis.” He gives dubium as its ally, to which, rather than to P. Rheas, L., I should have referred it. I do not remember seeing it recorded as a British casual before.—Ed.

Corydalis clavicula, DC. Wood at Holbrook, Suffolk, July, 1888.—H. E. Fox.

Fumaria confusa, Jord. Bullingdon, Oxon, September, 1888.—G. CLARIDGE DRUCE. “Probably confusa.”—J. G. Baker. Mr. James Groves would name it F. Borai. “In my opinion clearly Borai. The neck of fruit is of that, not of confusa; yet I admit the apex is like confusa. Habit and general character point to Borai, not confusa.”—Arth. Bennett. This plant has also been named by authorities as F. officinalis, F. muralis, and F. pallidiflora.—Ed. New County record.

F. parviflora, Lamk. Lowbury, Berks, June, 1888.—G. CLARIDGE DRUCE.

Nasturtium officinale, R. Br., var. microphyllum, Reichb. (Var. praecox, S. Gray, is an earlier name.) Headingtonwick, Oxon, July, 1886.—G. C. DRUCE.

Barbara praecox, R. Br. Heyford, Oxon, July, 1886.—G. CLARIDGE DRUCE.

Arabis petrae, Lamk., var. hispida, DC. Braeriach, Easterness, August, 1888. When growing on ledges and in rock fissures this plant was usually glabrous. The hispid form grew among moss and grass, on the north slopes of Braeriach, to the exclusion of the glabrous form.—G. CLARIDGE DRUCE.

A. petrae, Lamk., var. grandifolia, mihi. Ben Laoigh, Argyll and
Mid-Perth, August, 1888. Varies greatly as to leaf cutting, but never assuming the shape of the leaves of the Cairngorm plant, from which they differ in texture, colour, and size. The entire stem-leaves so characteristic of \textit{petrae}, are often developed to a striking extent. The flowers are much larger than in the Cairngorm plant. I could not see that the plant owed its difference in leaf-cutting to growing in a moister or drier situation. One of the most typically entire-leaved forms grew on the top of a detached boulder, while one of the most deeply cut-leaved forms on Ben Laoigh occurred in a water-course, and always wet with the spray from the waterfall; and this plant, too, was very hispid. Although it is difficult to place any varietal differences on paper, its appearance is so very different from the Cairngorm plant that I think it worth recognition. I have seen nothing like it from other localities. After one year’s cultivation the plants from the Cairngorm, and var. \textit{grandifolia} from Ben Laoigh, retain their respective characteristics.—G. \textsc{claridge druce}. "Is not this near \textit{floribunda}, Schur., and \textit{transsilvanica}, Schur.? but I have no specimen."—Arthur Bennett.

\textit{Arabis ciliata}, R. Br., var. \textit{hisplida}, Syme. Ex horto, Sprowston, 21st June, 1887.—E. F. \textsc{linton}.

\textit{Cardamine amara}, L.; pink flowered form. Heyford, Oxon, June, 1888; see \textit{Gren. et Godr., 'Fl. de France,'} vol. i. p. 19g. It is not the hybrid mentioned in ‘\textit{Fl. Oxfordshire},’ p. 28. Mons. Barbey says, "Should be a new and interesting variety for England."—G. \textsc{claridge druce}.

\textit{C. flexuosa}, With. Burghfield, Berks, August, 1888. Luxuriant shade-grown form, when the flowering is over having much the aspect of \textit{C. amara}.—G. \textsc{claridge druce}. It will come under the var. \textit{umbrosa} of Gr. et Godr.—Ed.

\textit{C. bulbifera}, Crantz. Loudwater, Bucks, June, 1885.—G. C. \textsc{druce}.

\textit{Draba rupestris}, R. Br. Ben Lawers, Mid-Perth, August, 1888.—Ed.

\textit{Erophila praecox}, Reichb. Old walls at Stone Easton, N. Somerset, 8th May, 1888. This brachycarpous form, known to me for some years, has been named \textit{praecox} by a Record Club referee.—J. \textsc{walter white}. This is the old \textit{Draba brachycarpa}. De Candolle named it an \textit{Erophila} before Reichenbach. I send a few specimens from Sparsey Bridge, Oxford, with more inflated fruit, but, still, rather to be referred to this than to \textit{E. inflata}, neither of which, in my opinion, is worthy of specific rank. Also type \textit{brachycarpa} from Stonesfield, Oxford, May, 1886.—Ed. New County record for Vice-county 6.

\textit{Cochlearia officinalis}, L., var. Rocky, damp ledges, near a small stream, E. side of Ben Hope, Sutherland, 2,600 feet, July, 1888.—J. \textsc{cosmo melvill}. Referees make no comment.—Ed.

\textit{Hesperis matronalis}, L. Woods at Amberley, Gloucestershire, July, 1888.—H. E. \textsc{fox}.

\textit{Sisymbrium pannonicum}, Jacq. The heaps of town refuse in St. Philip's, Bristol, have nourished a long list of alien plants, among
which this crucifer is a late arrival. In 1887 it occurred in fair quantity, and during the past summer in increased abundance. June, July, 1888.—J. WALTER WHITE. Placed under S. altissimum, L., by Nyman.—Ed.

*Erysimum orientale*, R. Br. Waste ground, Milverton, Warwickshire, June, 1888.—H. BROWNE. Isis Bank, Oxford, 1886.—G. C. DUCHE. In the ‘Genera Plantarum’ the section of *Erysimum*, to which this plant belongs, is made a separate genus, i.e., *Conringia*. Its specific name in that genus is, I believe, *C. perfoliata*, given it by Link (?) in ‘En. Hort. Berl.’ vol. ii. (1821). In DC. ‘System.’ 1824, Andrzejowski called it *C. orientalis*.—Ed.

*Subularia aquatica*, L. Angle Tarn, Cumberland, 2,000 feet, August, 1888.—H. E. Fox.

*Capsella Bursa-pastoris*, Mœnch. Nine Leicestershire forms sent. See ‘Midland Naturalist,’ August, 1885. The form which I have called cuneata seems to have been very abundant this year. I regard the prominence of the lobes of the capsule as an indication of strong vitality. If cuneata represents *stenocarpa* with stunted lobes, due to defective vitality, its abundance may be accounted for by the ungenial season.—F. T. MOTT.

*Leptidium Draba*, L. Maidenhead, Berks, June, 1882.—G. C. DUCHE.

——. Casual, by canal, Willesden, Middlesex, June, 1883, W. R. LINTON, is *Bunias orientalis*, L., which I have seen also near Maidenhead.—Ed.

*Helianthemum maritimum*, Mill, var. (vineale), Persoon. Cronkley Fell, Yorkshire, July, 1882.—G. C. DUCHE.


*V. Reichenbachiana*, Bor. Stonesfield, Oxon, May, 1887.—G. C. DUCHE.

*V. arenaria*, DC. Widdy Bank, Teesdale, Durham, July, 1886.—H. E. Fox.

*V. Curtisii*, Forster. A tall straggling form, a foot in height, growing amongst bracken, near Penrhôs, in the neighbourhood of Holyhead, Anglesea, 6th September, 1888.—CHARLES BAILEY.

*V. lutea*, Huds., var. *amena* (Symons). Clova, Forfar., July, 1882. Henslow reduced Symons’ *amena* to a var. of *lutea*, in 1829. A very large-flowered form occurred on the calcareous cliffs of Ben Lawers. This, Prof. Engler was inclined to think a *tricolor* form. Mons. Barbey says it is the var. *violacea* of Herb. Boiss. = *V. sudetica*, Willd, = *V. multicaulis*, Lejeune. Prof. Babington passes it as a *lutea* form. It is probably the *V. grandiflora* of Vill. Cat. Strasb.—G. CLARIDGE DUCHE.

*Polygala vulgaris*, L., var. *grandiflora*, Bab. Limestone rocks, Ben Bulben, Sligo, August, 1883.—S. A. STEWART. The Rev. A. Ley sends a plant similarly named from Craig Dulyn, Carnarvonshire, 21st August, 1888. This was, I believe, first recorded as a Welsh plant in the Record Club Report for 1878, by the Rev. A. Ley. I gathered a similar plant to the one now sent, about that date, on the
Glydyr, but subsequent study led me to doubt the correctness of the name. The variety grandiflora was first described in the 2nd edition of the 'Manual,' and Prof. Babington emphasises the character of the calyx wing having lateral veins which rejoin the mostly simple central vein near its tip, the calyx wings being oval apiculate. These characters are present in the Ben Bulben, but not in the Welsh plant, which again has not the coriaceous leaves, with somewhat revolute margins. I consider the Carnarvon plant is very slightly divergent from vulgaris, in the direction of grandiflora.—Ed. "I should call this, large-flowered vulgaris."—Arthur Bennett. I asked Prof. Babington if he could pass it as grandiflora; he says, "No." Mr. J. G. Baker says, "large-flowered vulgaris." Prof. Alfred Bennett writes, "I have no doubt you are quite right about the Polygala; it is simply eu-vulgaris, with slightly larger flowers. At all events it is quite safe to say that it is not the Irish grandiflora, which differs in its much larger and more coriaceous leaves, etc."

Polygala amara, L., var. uliginosa, Reichb. Sent as P. uliginosa, Fries. Cronkley Fell, Yorkshire, June, 1886.—H. E. Fox.

Saponaria Vaucaria, L. Railway bank, Milverton, Warwickshire, June, 1888.—H. Bromwich.

Silene Cucubalus, Wibel, var. puberula (Jord.). Sedgefield, Durham, July, 1888.—H. E. Fox.

S. quinquevulnera, L. Braye du Valle, Guernsey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.


Holosteum umbellatum, L. Banks of Darro, Alhambra, Spain, 17th April, 1887.—G. C. Druce.

Cerastium triviale, Link, var. holostecides (Fries). Banks of Tay, Mid-Perth June, 1882.—G. C. Druce.

C. triviale, var. alpestre. Rills at 2,800 feet, Carnedd Llewellyn, Carnarvonshire, 21st August, 1888.—Augustin Ley. This is a tall plant, 6 to 9 inches high, with flowers about twice as long as calyx, and narrow leaves. Mr. Baker says, "I should call alpestre, when petals are much longer than calyx." Mr. Bennett says he has "gathered specimens in Surrey with petals, relatively, as long as the sepals on Mr. Ley's Carnedd specimens; in the true alpine plant the petals are nearly twice as long as the sepals." Mr. Bennett gives as its synonyms, "C. vulgarum, v. alpestre, Hartm., 1870, ed. 1o. C. vulgarum, sub-sp. alpestre, Lindbl. (i Fr. s. v. sc. i) Hartm., ed. 11., 1879. All Fries seems to say about this in the 'Summa,' in 1846, under vulgarum, 'alpestre, Lindbl. (elatus grandiflor.)'" In Koch, 'Fl. Germ.' ed. i. (1835) p. 122, ed. ii. (1843) p. 134, ed. iii. (1857) p. 106, an alpine variety of C. triviale, Link, is described "folia latiora, ovalia, Flores paulo maiorae. Hæc varietas a C. alpino dignoscitur panicula multiflora, ramulis superioribus aggregatis, pilis rigidioribus brevioribus, caule elatiore, defectu rosularum sterilium, et petalis calycem æquantibus vel paulo tantum longioribus." A plant named alpestre by Dr. Boswell himself, in my possession, is more stunted, with shorter leaves, and much larger flowers than the Llewellyn specimens.

—Ed.
Cerasium triviale, Link, approaching alpestre. Brecon Beacons, at 2,600 feet, 8th August, 1888.—Augustin Ley. "Looks to me a dwarf triviale."—J. G. Baker. A similar form can be seen on village walls, near Oxford.—Ed.

C. alpinum, L., var. lanatum (Lamk.). Ben Laoigh, Argyll, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce.


A. tenuifolia, L., var. laxa (Jord.). Lakenheath, Suffolk, W., July, 1882.—G. C. Druce.

A. serpyllifolia, L., var. glutinosa, Koch. Penard, Glamorganshire, 30th July, 1888.—W. R. Linton. Also from Redcliff, Sandown Bay, Isle of Wight, May, 1880; abundant. I send these as apparently agreeing with descriptions in 'Students' Flora,' and 'Flora of Hampshire,' of Koch's glutinosa, a form of which I know nothing, except from these descriptions.—W. Movle Rogers. Koch's description in 'Fl. Germ.,' p. 128, is as follows:—"Glutinosa; minor, erecta vel ascensdens, superne pilis glanduliferis tecta. A. viscosa, Lois. Not., p. 68, et Haller fil. sec. Hegeschw." The Penard plant is quite typical, and the Isle of Wight appears fairly to come under the variety. Passed as glutinosa, Koch, by Prof. Babington, which he considers as identical with A. viscosa, Lois.—Ed.

A. ciliata, L. Limestone rocks, King's Mountain, Sligo, July, 1879.—S. A. Stewart.

Sagina maritima, Don, var. (densa), Jord. Dry, sandy, sea-side bank, Ballybunnion, co. Kerry, June, 1885.—S. A. Stewart.

Polycarpos tetraphyllum, L. St. Helier's, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.


Elatine hexandra, DC., Llyn Badric, Anglesey, August, 1888.—J. E. Griffith.

Lavatera sylvestris, Brot. Hort., Bangor; seed from Ruelli Brays, Guernsey, 18th August, 1888.—J. E. Griffith. On seeing this, I noticed it was Malva sylvestris, L., not Lavatera, so wrote to Mr. Griffith for information regarding its origin. He replied that he had the seed from Guernsey, and distributed specimens, which I have not seen, through the Exchange Club last year. I submitted a specimen to Mr. Baker, who says, "Yes; only Malva sylvestris, L." Shortly
after writing to Mr. Griffith I received this note from Mr. W. W. Reeves, "Correction in Report for 1886, p. 146. The plant which I sent to the Club as Lavatera sylvestris I have had since under cultivation, and proved it to be a species of Malva." He since writes me that his and Mr. Griffith's seeds probably came from the same locality in Guernsey. As the 'Students' Flora' gives no description of Lavatera sylvestris, I may say it was first described and figured in Brotero's 'Flora Lusit.,' and 'Phytograph Lusit. Select.' It may be at once distinguished from Malva sylvestris by its generic characters, which are rather artificial, viz., the epicalyx in Lavatera is deeply tripartite, while but distinctly three-leaved in Malva, although these are united at the base. The foliage of Lavatera is paler and duller, owing to its stellate hairiness. The fruit is larger, that is wider, in Malva, from the more numerous cocci. It is figured and described in 'Journ. Bot.' 1877, p. 259; and described in the 8th edition of the 'Manual.'—Ed.

Impatiens Noli tangere, L. Woods near Windermere Station, Westmoreland, August, 1888. H. E. Fox.

Acer campestre, L., var. hebecarpum, DC. South Stoke, Oxon, July, 1888.—G. C. Druce. The description of this (the prevailing form in Britain, as far as my experience goes,) in the 'Prodromus' is var. a. hebecarpum, DC., "fructibus velutino-pubescentibus = A. campestre, Wallr. in litt. Tratt. Arch. i. n. 7, i.c." Var. b. "collinum (Wallr. in litt.) fructibus glabris, foliorum lobis obtusis, floribus minoribus," occurs "in Gallia"; and a third variety, i.e., c. austriacum, Tratt., l.c.; fructibus glabris, foliorum lobis subacuminatis, floribus majoribus," is localised in Austria. The position of this variety in Lond. Cat. scarcely appears correct, as I suppose it is really the type.—Ed.


T. Molinerii, Balb. Lizard Head, Cornwall, June, 1873.—W. Moyle Rogers. Portelet Isle, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.

T. striatum, var. erectum, Leighton. Woodloes, Warwickshire, June, 1888.—H. Bromwich. Not Leighton's plant described in 'Fl. Salop,' p. 363, "stems 12 inches or more high, copiously branched from the base, erect or ascending. Leaves very distant, lower ones on rather long petioles, leaflets obcordato-cuneate, upper ones on shorter petioles or nearly sessile, leaflets obovato-elliptical, all sinuato-denticulate in the upper portion. Heads of flowers much longer, ovate, sub-conical." The heads in these specimens are even shorter than usual, the plant is only stunted, erect, striatum, receding, in fact, from the type one way, as true erectum does in the other. The Rev. W. A. Leighton had the true plant from Salop, Barmouth, and Naples. It occurs in Berks and Northants!—Ed.

T. strictum, L. La Moye, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.
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Lotus tenuis, Kit. Ellington, Northumberland, August, 1887.—H. E. Fox.

L. angustissimus, L. Furzy, stony ground, about nine miles from the sea (Little Haldon Hill between), Trusham, S. Devon, 8th July, 1878.—W. Moyle Rogers. St. Brelades, Jersey, June, 1887.—G. C. Druce.

L. hispidus, Desf. L'Etac, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce. Lizard Head, Cornwall, 1873. Bank of River Otter (at about a mile from the sea), S. Devon, in plenty, August, 1887, a supply of specimens showing different colouring of the standard in the two species, viz., fading to a dull green in hispidus, while remaining yellow or orange in angustissimus; whereas in Bab. ‘Man.’ the exact opposite of this is stated.—W. Moyle Rogers. Dr. Boswell did not place much reliance on this characteristic, for he says sometimes angustissimus turns green also.—Ed.

Oxypolis uralensis, DC. Grassy slopes, Betty Hill, Melvich, and Armadale, North Sutherland, on sea cliffs, 24th July, 1888.—J. Cosmo Melvill.

O. campestris, DC. Glen Dole, Forfar, August, 1882.—G. C. Druce.


R. plicatus, W. & N. Near Rudyard Reservoir, Stafford, 12th September, 1888.—W. H. Painter, “fide W. H. Purchas.” “Not the common form, perhaps a variety.”—Dr. Focke. “I think this is lentiginosus, which must be removed from the Suberecti (Mr. Painter’s specimens are none of them satisfactory.”)—C. C. Babington. New County record.


R. Lindleianus, Lees, var. Much smaller in all respects than usual. (?) var. nitidus, Bell Salt, not W. & N., or is it only a form of rhamnifolius? Keston Common, Kent, July, 1888.—Eyre de Crespiigny. New County record. “Good Lindleianus.”—W. Moyle Rogers, who adds, “It seems clear, from ‘British Rubi,’ p. 79, that Bell Salter’s nitidus is identical with Lindleianus. On the other hand Bloxam’s nitidus, sent by Mr. Bagnall, from Marston Green, Warwick, has a look of calvatus, especially in the panicle.” The Editor would explain that Dr. Crespiigny has not always put the same names on the label as on the accompanying note, so that members may be puzzled. The Editor has, as much as possible, embodied all the suggested names at the expense of space.
When in doubt, it is better to leave the name open on the label, and to make the remarks on the notes. "R. Lindleianus, Lees."—Dr. Focke. 


_Rubus rhamnifolius_, W. & N., a var. intermediate with _R. Maassii_, Focke, teste J. G. Baker. This season the leaflets are more rounded below, and more nearly approaching _Maassii_. Hayes Common, Kent, July, 1888.—_EYRE DE CRESPIGNY_. "Form of the _rhamnifolius_ group, near _R. Muenteri_, Mars."—Dr. Focke. "Can it be Lindleianus?"—C. C. Babington.

_R. septorum_, Müll. Bradley, S. Derbyshire, 20th August, 1888.—_W. R. LINTON_. "Why call this _septorum_? Genevier's specimens of that are as he describes them, felted beneath the leaves. Focke is wrong in saying that Genevier places it among the _Suberecti_, unless he refers to some old essay which I have not seen. In my opinion it certainly does not belong to that group. This Bradley specimen seems to belong to the _Rhamnifolii_. I should like to know more about it. I cannot name it."—C. C. Babington. "Septorum, I believe."—Dr. Focke.

_R. Questierii_, P. J. Müll. Wood and rough ground near Bishopwood, Herefordshire, 30th July, 1888. This appears to be a remarkable form allied to _R. macrophyllus_, W. and N. It occurs for nearly a square mile of rough and wooded ground in the above locality, and keeps its character well. The specific name I have ventured to give on account of its rather close resemblance to a plant picked by me in Jersey, and so named by Dr. Focke, in 1885. But I have seen no description of _Questierii_, nor do I know what other forms it is related to.—_AUGUSTIN LEY_. "Stem more channelled than usual. It is described by Genevier, p. 199. It is closely allied to _calvatus_, and with it will probably join with _Salteri_ as an aggregate species."—C. C. Babington. "R. pubescens, W. and N. I have seen; however, the true _R. Questierii_ from different places in S. England."—Dr. Focke.

_R. Salteri_, Bab. "Woods, Aconbury, Herefordshire, 12th September, 1888.—_AUGUSTIN LEY_. "This name appears to be correct."—Dr. Focke.

? Mousehold Heath, Norfolk, 20th September, 1888.—_E. F. LINTON_. "Imperfect specimen; perhaps near _R. argentatus_, P. J. Müll."—Dr. Focke. "When shall we persuade even good collectors to take note of the flowers? I think this is my _vestitus_, which is hardly distinguishable from _leucostachys_, and probably ought not to be. It is also probably the _conspicuus_, Müll., and _Leightonianus_."—C. C. Babington.

_R. calvatus_, Blox. = _villicaulis_, Kœhl., teste Dr. Focke. Shirley, Derbyshire, September, 1888.—_W. R. LINTON_. "Is what Bloxam named _heteroclitus_. In my 'Notes' I placed it under _villicaulis_, and I think I did right. I have Müller's and also Wirtgen's specimens before me."—C. C. Babington. Mr. Linton notes, "Dr. Focke without expressly assenting to this naming remarked on the identity, in his judgment, of _calvatus_ and _villicaulis_."
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Rubus? Biddulph Hall, Staffordshire, 23rd July, 1888.—W. H. Painter. "I cannot name this satisfactorily. It clearly belongs to Babington’s ‘Sylvestris’ but it does not appear to be any clearly recognisable form."—W. H. Purchas. "Apparently there is some confusion here. Two pieces of barren stem are given which can hardly belong to the same plant. One with a thick coat of hair, but no felt; but many sunken setae, is probably the right piece, the other is quite glabrous. The flowering shoot, although very hairy, is apparently not setose. I do not know what to say about it."—C. C. Babington.

Rubus? Brides Stones (which are the remains of a kistvarn, and the Rubus was growing within the place of sepulture) Biddulph, Staffordshire, September, 1888.—W. H. Painter. "I think this is the same as that from Biddulph Hall, only less vigorous in growth."—W. H. Purchas. "Is, I think, a form of villicaulis."—C. C. Babington. "R. amplificatus, Lees, I think, which includes, however, several different modifications."—Dr. Focke.

R. Maassii, Focke. See Rep., 1887, p. 170. These were seen by Mr. Bailey at Rudyard reservoir, and the specimens now sent are intended for vouchers of the new county record. 21st September, 1888.—W. H. Painter. "As for as I can see this specimen does not differ from the Scandinavian R. Lindebergii, P. J. Muell."—Dr. Focke. "R. Maassii, I think, but rather more thorny than usual. It also goes to nemoralis probably."—C. C. Babington.

R. Borreri, Bell-Salt variety? Wood, Beacon Hill, Monmouth, 28th September, 1888. This plant grows in the same plantation as the R. virescens, G. Braun. Plants from the same plantation were sent by me to the Club in 1886, and named both by Prof. Babington and Dr. Focke, R. Sprengelii, W. The present plant is not, I think, identical with these. It has the partly suberect habit of R. virescens noted above.—Augustin Ley. "I can give no name to this form."—Dr. Focke. Prof. Babington does not report.

R. virescens, G. Braun. Woods, Beacon Hill, Monmouthshire, 28th September, 1888. This name is given in reliance upon specimens sent to Dr. Focke from the same station in 1885, and which were named by him, "R. virescens, G. Braun, var. glandulosa. The typical plant has no glandular bristles on the flower stalks." I must acknowledge, however, that I am not perfectly satisfied that the plant now sent is identical with that submitted to Dr. Focke. The present plant is almost, though not completely, suberect; the petals are small and whitish, the stamens whitish, the styles a full green.—Augustin Ley. "I am very glad to see the virescens, Braun, identified by Focke. I fancy it ought to go with Borreri to Sprengelii."—C. C. Babington. "Leaves exactly as in virescens, but the other characters do not agree. I can give no name."—Dr. Focke.

R. Münteri, Mass. Yeldersley, South Derbyshire, 29th August, 1888.—W. R. Linton. I do not think this Münteri but Maassii. Probably both go to nemoralis, Müll., the older name.

different in toothing and texture from the other Derbyshire Münteri.”
—W. Moyle Rogers. “An interesting specimen being authenticated
by Focke.”—C. C. Babington. New County record.

R. near rhombifolius, Wh., Dr. Focke. Brailsford, S. Derbyshire, August, 1888.—W. R. Linton. “I leave this to bear the name
attached to it by Focke, but what is the colour of its flowers?”—C. C.
Babington. New County record.

R. leucandrus, Focke. “Very near my leucandrus, which has,
however, white flowers.”—Dr. Focke. Brailsford, S. Derbyshire,
August, 1888. This and the last are very similar, and I should think
likely to turn out to be the same thing, deriving such differences as
they do from diversity of situation.—W. R. Linton. “I presume,
from the notice on the ticket, that this has pink flowers. Is it so?
Probably leucandrus.”—C. C. Babington.

R. macrophyllus, W. and N., glabratus. Rigg’s Wood, Sellack,
Herefordshire, 29th August, 1888.—Augustin Ley. “Yes; which
I now place with Münteri as nemoralis, Müll.”—C. C. Babington. “I
can give no name to this form”—Dr. Focke. New County record.

R. Sprengelii, Weihe, var. rubicolor, Blox., R. erubescens, Wirtg.
Marshy thicket, Coughton, Herefordshire, July, 1888.—Augustin
Ley. “Recalls the erubescens, but it is perhaps near R. hirtifolius,
Muell. et Wirtg.”—Dr. Focke. Marshy woods, Bishopsworth, Herefordshire, 30th July, 1888.—Augustin Ley. “I think that what I
have called erubescens is scarcely that plant. I now wish to call it
rubicolor, Blox., and place it under Sprengelii.”—C. C. Babington.

R. rhenanus, Müll.? Rigg’s Wood, Sellack, Herefordshire, 30th
August, 1888. Manor Wood, Whitebrook, Monmouthshire, 28th
September, 1888.—Augustin Ley. These plants both of them
resemble somewhat a plant sent through the Club from Highgate
wood, Middlesex, in 1878, by Dr. Eyre de Crencigny, as R. Bloxamii,
but which Professor Babington named very near, if not exactly, the
rhenanus, Müll. See ‘Rep.’ 1879, p. 9. I am not satisfied, however,
that the plants I now send are really identical, either with this Highgate
wood plant, or with each other; and they seem to be certainly
different from Mr. Arthur Brigg’s plant from the Plymouth district, to
which the name of rhenanus has been given with some certainty, and
which Prof. Babington now identifies with the R. thyrsiger [var.
thyrsiger, Bab.—Ed.] of L. C., ed. viii. See ‘Journ. Bot.’ December,
1888, p. 379.—Augustin Ley. “I consider the Monmouth plant
to be weak rhenanus, and the Herefordshire plant to be also rhenanus,
but I am not quite satisfied with either plant.”—C. C. Babington.
Of the Monmouth plant, which alone he saw, Dr. Focke writes, “R.
Lohri, Wirtg.” “This is the R. Bloxamii of the ‘Flora of Plymout-
hich was described by Babington in his ‘Notes on Rubi,’ in
‘Journ. Bot.’ July, 1888, under the name of thyrsiger [see above note
and ‘Journ. Bot.’ December, 1888, p. 379]. To the description given
of this plant from road-side, Crabtree, Egg Buckland, South Devon,
13th August, 1888, I can add, petals regularly disposed, ovate
oblong, entire, distant, rather large, pink or pinkish white; stamens
pink, very long, and much exceeding the styles; anthers ultimately
fuscous; styles purplish pink; stigmas greenish yellow; sepals reflexed from the flower, patent or clasping the fruit. I can now add to the station under Dist. IV. of 'Flora of Plymouth,' hedge near Shaugh Bridge, by the road to Bickleigh Railway Station, and field at Fursdon, Egg Buckland. As I have met with it in one spot across the Tamar, this bramble belongs to E. Cornwall as well as to S. Devon.”—T. R. Archer Briggs. “I do not know what may be R. rhenanus, Müll., but I can assert that such a plant as this does not grow in the Valley of the Rhine. It seems to be a decidedly western type.”—Dr. Focke.

"Rubus Bloxamii, Lecs. Shirley, S. Derbyshire, August, 1888.\n\nSent for confirmation. It is new to this district.—W. R. LINTON.\n"Bloxamii, I think.”—Dr. Focke. “Bloxamii.”—C. C. Babington. New County record.


The prevailing bramble in the lower part of Glen Artney, Comrie, Perth, 30th July, 1888.—J. Cosmo MELVILL. “As this is the prevailing bramble there, it is much to be wished that better foliage of stem had been gathered; without that, I cannot say to what form of Kaehleri it belongs, probably to my pallidus, not that of W. & N.”—C. C. Babington. “R. rosaceus, W. & N.”—Dr. Focke.

"R. debilis, Boul. Linton Wood, Herefordshire, 25th September, 1888.—AUGUSTIN LEY. “Surely very different from Mr. Briggs' St. Budeaux plant, mentioned with it in last year's report, and referred to by Babington as R. debilis, Boul. (?) in his 'Notes' in 'Journ. Bot.' 1886, p. 229. In the St. Budeaux plant the setae are so very few on the barren stem, and the prickles so scattered and unequal, that it would seem out of place among the Radulæ. This objection does not apply to the Linton plant, which, however, can hardly be made to agree with Babington's description of debilis; both setæ and hairs on barren stem, e.g., being numerous, and the leaves 3-nate instead of 5-nate pedate, and the terminal leaflet oblong-obovate, instead of cordate-ovate.”—W. Moyle Rogers. “Is R. fuscus.—W. & N.”—Dr. Focke.

"R. echinatus, Lindl. Berkhamstead, Herts, September, 1886.—W. MOYLE ROGERS.

R. sertiflorus, P. J. Müll. Rigg's Wood, Sellack, Herefordshire, 28th August, 1888.—Augustin Ley. "R. sertiflorus."—C. C. Babington. "The name may be correct, but this plant seems to be the same as R. Laehri, Wirtg."—Dr. Focke.

R. Kahleri, W., var.? Thicket by the Cennen River, Carmarthenshire, 6th September, 1888. I have no other name to give this bramble, yet I do not think it can be R. Kahleri. It is extremely similar to a plant I obtained near Tilley, Herefordshire, a few years ago, which was attributed to R. Hystrix, W. & N., by Mr. Archer Briggs, but which is very different from what I have been accustomed to look upon as R. Hystrix in S. Herefordshire."—Augustin Ley. "I should say a very setose and aculeate state of R. rosaceus, W. & N."—Dr. Focke. "I think velatus, Lef."—C. C. Babington.

R. Kahleri, W., var.? Rough ground, Shucknell Hill, Herefordshire, 18th September, 1888. This, again, I am at a loss to name. The amount of soft hair developed on some parts of the plant, especially of the barren stems, is remarkable.—Augustin Ley. "R. mutabilis, Genev.?"—Dr. Focke. Should it not be panicle instead of barren stems?—Ed.

R. pallidus, W. & N. Westhide Wood, Herefordshire, 18th September, 1888. I do not feel sure that this is identical with the plant sent out by Rev. E. F. Linton, in 1885 and 1886, under that name, but I do not know what else to call it.—Augustin Ley. "Not one with the plant named for Rev. E. F. Linton, by Dr. Focke, but apparently intermediate between it and rosaceus, Wh. & N., if distinguishable from rosaceus."—W. Moyle Rogers. "I will not venture to name it. It appears to be not far from R. rotundifolius, Blox. It is not R. pallidus, W. & N."—E. F. Linton. "Apparently the true pallidus, but not the form of Kahleri."—C. C. Babington. "Seems to be intermediate between R. Kahleri and R. pallidus, W. & N."—Dr. Focke.

R. pallidus, W. & N. Moist border of a wood near Edford, N. Somerset, 8th October, 1888. See 'Journ. Bot.,' 1889, p. 118.—J. Walter White. "This is the true continental pallidus, W. & N. It agrees admirably with what I have been gathering for three or four years in Norfolk, differing only in having leaves of a thicker texture and narrower width. The only other British specimens I have seen are also from Somerset. They were collected by the Rev. R. P. Murray, and as far as I can recollect resembled Mr. White's specimen rather than mine."—E. F. Linton. "R. pallidus, W. & N."—Dr. Focke.

R. longithyrsiger, Lees. Between Watersmeet and Ilford Bridges, North Devon, in good quantity, July, 1881.—W. Moyle Rogers. "Yes."—Dr. Focke.

R. saxicolus, P. J. Müll. Woods, Great Doward, Herefordshire, 13th September, 1888. Woods, the Buckstane, West Gloster, 13th October, 1888.—Augustin Ley. "Not saxicolus, if that name is to
be retained for the many plants to which Prof. Babington has given it lately, e.g., Mr. Painter's, Knypersley, Staff., 1885. See "B. E. C. Report, 1885," p. 126."—W. Moyle Rogers. Both the above Prof. Babington names "saxicolus." Dr. Focke only saw the Gloster plant; he says, "form of the hirtus group, not the German R. saxicolus."

Rubus Gelertii, Friderichsen. Beeston, St. Andrew, Norfolk, E., 30th August, 1888. Named originally by Dr. Focke. On seeing further specimens from me last autumn, Dr. Focke observed that they were "near R. Gelertii, Frid., and my R. Banningii, but not identical with either of these nearly allied forms."—E. F. Linton. "Gelertii, probably, as Focke says. I have a beautiful series from Friderichsen, and our plant agrees very well with them. I should describe the terminal leaflet of his specimen as rather acuminate than cuspidate."

—C. C. Babington.


R. adornatus, Müll. Gorstley quarries, Herefordshire, 25th September, 1888.—Augustin Ley. "Why called adornatus? The foliage sent is not satisfactory. It does not agree with the description nor species. Is it not what I called velatus, for Mr. Ley, from Cowleigh Park, 19th July, 1887?"—C. C. Babington. "Is R. muricatus, Boul. et Gil., a more pubescent form of R. scaber, Wh. & N."

—Dr. Focke.

R. Purchasii, Blox. Bradley, S. Derbyshire, 20th September, 1888.—W. R. Linton. Westhide Wood, Herefordshire, 18th September, 1888. Fields, borders Glynhir, Carmarthenshire, 6th September, 1888.—Augustin Ley. From a root brought from the original station, and grown in the garden at Alstonfield Vicarage, October, 1888.—W. H. Purchas. "I send this from a new S. Devon station (wood, Whitleigh, near Tamerton Folioti, August, 1888). Is certainly similar to the bramble given under this name in the 'Rep. of Bot. Ex. Club' for 1887, collected from a wood, Howle Hill, Herefordshire, 18th July, 1887, by Rev. Augustin Ley. It is a well marked plant."—T. R. Archer Briggs. Prof. Babington only saw Mr. Linton's and Mr. Ley's Carmarthenshire specimens. Of these he writes "these are Purchasii, which I believe to be Drejeri, the older name." Dr. Focke writes, "Mr. Purchas has sent me, besides the wild type, a cultivated specimen of it which I cannot distinguish from R. mucronatus, Blox." This also refers to Mr. Ley's plant. Of Mr. Briggs' plant Dr. Focke says, "This seems to be not identical with the type of Rev. W. Purchas. It is nearer the R. Kächleri."

R. velatus, Lef.? Wood border, Manor Wood, Whitebrook, Monmouthshire, 18th September, 1888. This plant bears strong resemblance to one so named by Prof. Babington last year, from Cowleigh Park, Herefordshire. I have not, however, seen any description of R. velatus, Lef.—Augustin Ley. "Velatus."—C. C. Babington. Form of the hirtus group. There is a description of R. velatus in Genevier's 'Monographie des Rubus du Bassin de la Loire,' 2nd edition (1880), p. 97.—Ed.
Rubus serpens, Weihe. Wood, Beacon Hill, Monmouthshire, 28th September, 1888. I traced this for a distance of some five miles from Whitebrook to Tintern, on the woods bordering the Wye on the west. It stands well apart from R. flexuosus, which also occurs in these woods.—Augustin Ley.  "Whom does this come from? I think it is the plant named fuscus, by Focke, for Mr. Ley. I am not clear at present where to place this. Focke says near scaber."—C. C. Babington. "Small form of the hirtus group."—Dr. Focke.

R. chlorothyrsus, Focke. Shirley, S. Derbyshire, 11th September, 1888.—W. R. Linton. "I am still in much difficulty between the foliosus of Devonshire, which is, I think, the chlorothyrsus, and the other foliosus of Bloxam. I think this specimen is the former from a more northern locality than usual."—C. C. Babington. "Doubtful, but not R. chlorothyrsus."—Dr. Focke.

R. hirtus, W. & N., var. rotundifolius, Blox. Between Chudleigh and Trusham, S. Devon, 16th September, 1879, teste C. C. Babington. Also the same, or forms intermediate between rotundifolius and hirtus, Teign Valley, S. Devon, 1879, Dux Common, Bridgule, 1884. Moorend, Okehampton, N. Devon, 1882. The North Devon plants (growing in much bleaker localities) have stronger prickles, and thicker, hairier leaves than the S. Devon one, named rotundifolius by Prof. Babington, but they do not otherwise seem different."—W. Moyle Rogers. Single specimens are very inconvenient to the distributor.—Ed.

R. hirtus, W. & N. Mousehold Heath, Norfolk, 8th September, 1888, teste Dr. Focke. Specimens from the same spot were referred to rotundifolius by Prof. Babington. As the plants from which specimens were gathered are invariably ternate, it should, perhaps, rather go under the latter name. Probably this distinction is not recognised on the Continent.—E. F. Linton.

R. tereticaulis, P. J. Müll. Beeston Copse, near Sprowston, Norfolk, E., 30th August, 1888. So named for me by Dr. Focke. Prof. Babington assented to the name, remarking that it seemed to approach very nearly to flexuosus. To my eyes it appears more closely to resemble ternate R. hirtus.—E. F. Linton.

R. fuscus, W. & N. Woods, Aconbury, Herefordshire, 12th September, 1888. Lodge Grove, Bishopsgrove, Herefordshire, July, 1888. This is the same plant as I sent out last year without a name, also from Aconbury Wood, though from a station fully two miles distant from the present one, and which was named R. fuscus by Dr. Focke. It is a frequent plant in parts of Herefordshire. I wish to correct here a clerical error which I made in page 176 of 'Report' for 1887. ‘R. hirtus, W. & N., Woods, Welsh Newton, and Bishopsgrove, Herefordshire,’ should have been ‘R. fuscus, W. & N.’ Those plants are identical with those I sent, in 1886, from the same localities under the name of ‘fuscus, W. & N.’ See 'Report,' 1886, pp. 149–150. I cannot, however, see how these very hairy plants can receive the same name as the Kohleri-like plants sent both this year and last from Aconbury Wood."—Augustin Ley. "Doubtful."—Dr. Focke. "Fuscus of Focke."—C. C. Babington.
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R. horridus, Schultz, not Htn. a corylifolian form; petals usually white, but in the specimen sent of a deep rose colour; stem somewhat angular, very prickly, neither glaucous nor pruinose. Hedge in a field adjoining Croham Hurst, Croydon, July, 1888.—Eyre de Cresigny. "Not identical with German forms."—Dr. Focke. "Apparently Lecoqii, Gen. It is one of the many plants confounded by authors under casius. It is one of the Eu-casu of Genevier. A very interesting plant. I should like to see more of it, and better specimens."—C. C. Babington.

Rubus casius, L. var. intermedius, Bab. Harling to Lorling, Norfolk, W., 3rd October, 1888. Owing to a remarkably late season, I was not able to gather good specimens of this and other Rubi in October. The barren shoots were not all matured, but portions of old stems at base of the panicle show well the alternate armature. I have scarcely come across any varieties of casius in Norfolk.—E. F. Linton. "What a very bad leaf! Apparently casius—intermedius."—C. C. Babington. "May be; but too imperfect."—Dr. Focke.


Mr. Baker says "Compare tomentella; I think, not involuta."


R. mollis, Sm., var. glabra, Fries. Strome Ferry, West Ross, 3rd August, 1888. In 1884 my brother and I discovered only two or three bushes of this Rose, close together, and from them we sent up a few specimens to the club labelled Rosa mollis, var. As I remarked in last year’s ‘Report,’ "Dr. N. J. Scheutz has identified specimens of mine as the var. glabra of Fries." This last summer we were able to find a few more bushes more than half-a-mile from those first found, along the line of rail; and to note that the petals, in a few belated flowers under the shade of a rock, were pure white.—
E. F. Linton. Also sent by W. R. Linton "C'est peut-être une forme glabre du \textit{R. mollis}, Sm., mais je n’oserairien certifier. C’est, dans tous les cas, une forme très-curieuse et qui me paraît nouvelle."—F. Crépin.


\textit{R. tomentosa}, Sm., v. \textit{farinosa}. Westhope Hill, Herefordshire, 2nd July, 1888.—Augustin Ley. "In Mr. Baker’s ‘Monograph,’ \textit{farinosa} is described as having ‘short peduncles quite destitute of aciculi and glandular setæ,’ and pétioles only ‘slightly glandular,’ characters which cannot certainly be attributed to Mr. Ley’s plant, though it seems rightly placed under \textit{tomentosa}.”—W. Moyle Rogers. "La seule fleur qui existe sur l’échantillon a quelques rares glandes sur son pédicelle. C’est probablement une forme de transition vers le \textit{R. farinosa}.”—F. Crépin. Mr. Baker crosses out \textit{farinosa}.


\textit{Rosa scabriuscula}, Sm., var., with assurgent calyx. Wood, Coldborough Park, Herefordshire, 25th September, 1888.—Augustin Ley. "This will not do for \textit{scabriuscula}, which has much less clothing and less glandular leaves, and straighter prickles. I should have named it simply \textit{R. tomentosa}, Sm.”—W. Moyle Rogers. "La var. du \textit{R. tomentosa}, connue sous le nom du \textit{R. scabriuscula}, est moins tomenteuse que cette plante. C’est toutefois une forme qui se rapproche de celle-la.”—F. Crépin.


**Rosa micrantha**, Sm., var. Briggsii. Pedunculo nudo. Habitat ad margines agrorum juxta Woodspring, in comitatu Somersetsiensi, Sep., 1888. From the same bushes that have been twice supplied to the Club, and to which Mr. Briggs gave the name.—J. WALTER WHITE. "Si je vois bien, ce n'est pas une var. du *R. micrantha* mais simplement une variation du *R. agrestis*, Sav. (=*R. sepium*, Thuill.).—F. Crépin. This disposes of 512b of Lond. Cat.—Éd.

*R. micrantha*, Sm., var. Briggsii, Baker. Bank, Shalaford, Egg Buckland, S. Devon, July, 1888. I intended, last season, to get pieces of the plant in fruit, and showing the barren stem, to put with the flowering ones now sent, but unfortunately let the time slip by.—T. R. ARCHER BRIGGS. These did not reach the Editor in time to be sent to Monsieur Crépin.

*R. micrantha*, Sm., var. Briggsii, Baker. Bank, Shalaford, Egg Buckland, S. Devon, July, 1888. I intended, last season, to get pieces of the plant in fruit, and showing the barren stem, to put with the flowering ones now sent, but unfortunately let the time slip by.—T. R. ARCHER BRIGGS. These did not reach the Editor in time to be sent to Monsieur Crépin.

*R. micrantha*, Sm., var. Briggsii, Baker. Bank, Shalaford, Egg Buckland, S. Devon, July, 1888. I intended, last season, to get pieces of the plant in fruit, and showing the barren stem, to put with the flowering ones now sent, but unfortunately let the time slip by.—T. R. ARCHER BRIGGS. These did not reach the Editor in time to be sent to Monsieur Crépin.

*R. micrantha*, Sm., var. Briggsii, Baker. Bank, Shalaford, Egg Buckland, S. Devon, July, 1888. I intended, last season, to get pieces of the plant in fruit, and showing the barren stem, to put with the flowering ones now sent, but unfortunately let the time slip by.—T. R. ARCHER BRIGGS. These did not reach the Editor in time to be sent to Monsieur Crépin.


*R. canina*, L., var. subcrisata, Baker. With sepals and peduncles setose. Stydd, S. Derbyshire, 3rd October, 1888.—W. R. LINTON. This may be a weak form of subcrisata, such as I have seen (very rarely) in the hilly parts of Devon; but on the whole I should prefer placing it under *verticillacantha*, Mérat."—W. MOYLE ROGERS. "Trop incomplet pour bien juger."—F. Crépin.


*R. canina, L., var. coriifolia* (Fries). Form with setose sepals. Berriedale, Sutherland, July, 1888.—W. R. Linton. "Yes, if the sepals are really subcristate; a point left uncertain by my specimen."—W. Moyle Rogers. "Appartient au R. coriifolia, Fries. C'est une variation à dents irrégulières doubles, triples ou simples."—F. Crépin.

*R. ———, peduncles and sepals setose, leaflets of urbica; named by Mr. Baker "Reuteri, with glandular sepals."* Near Hogmanston, Derbyshire, September, 1888. This form by its prickles recalls tomentosa, whilst it has the leaflets of urbica, and in other respects it is divergent from typical *Reuteri* (=glauca Vill), which occurs in a few places in this district.—W. R. Linton. "Pubescence extrêmement faible; pétiole un peu pubescent; côte mediane un peu pubescent; parfois q. q. rares poils sur les nervures secondaires. Peut-être une variété du R. coriifolia, Fries."—F. Crépin.

*R. stylosa, var. pseudo-rusticana, Crép.* Leigh, 4th August, and Beer Hackett, 31st August, both in Dorset; and also in field-hedge between Hagler's Hole and Sedgehill, S. Wilts., 1st September, 1888. Seen only in hedges. A new white flowered glabrous-leaved form of *R. stylosa*, thus named for me by M. Crépin in March last, after having been sent by me to the club for distribution two years before, labelled *R. virginea*, Rip. For description &c., see "Jour. Bot.," January, 1889.—W. Moyle Rogers.

*R. stylosa, Desv., var. leucocroha* (Desv.). A very strongly growing rose, abundant on the banks of marsh ditches in the lowlands near Worle, North Somerset. When in early bloom the column of styles is only prominent in the primordial flowers; but in fruit this character is well marked throughout. 12th September, 1888.—J. Walter White. "Pubescence à peu près bornée à la nervure médiane; pétioles glabrescents. C'est une var. du R. stylosa voisine du R. rusticana, Déségl."—F. Crépin.

*R. leucocroha, Desv.* I have been urged to write a note and ask for its insertion in this report on the plants which I sent to the club thus named last year as new county records for Dorset and S. Hants. The members who received those specimens may well have doubted whether they were worth keeping when they read M. Crépin's note in the Report—"This is a *stylosa* form, but it is impossible to say whether it should be placed under *R. stylosa* Desv. or *R. leucocroha* Desv." It may interest these members therefore to learn that in March, 1888, without having heard of this note (already sent to Mr. Nicholson, I suppose), I forwarded nine sheets of specimens to M. Crépin, all labelled *R. leucocroha*—eight being from Devon localities, and the ninth the plant from Dorset which had been sent to the Club—and that M. Crépin most kindly wrote a separate note for each sheet, confirming the name *leucocroha*, with the qualification in
every case added, “if the corolla is white.” The fact is I have never thought of naming any rose leucochroa that had not white petals; but, I must add, that is far from being the only character on which I rely in distinguishing this rose from other kindred stylosa and canina forms. Fully to justify the application of the name leucochroa to any bush, it should have, I think, in combination with a white corolla, a markedly stiff and erect habit, peduncles of moderate length, well clothed with setae, styles nearly or quite glabrous, leaflets just intermediate in size and outline between systyla and obtusifolia, glabrous above, hairy on the veins beneath, and ciliate, and prickles remarkably hooked (especially on the flowering shoots) also just intermediate between those of systyla and obtusifolia. These prickles (usually red) have much longer points than those of systyla and stylosa, and, in conjunction with the stiff habit and rather small obovate leaflets (sharply simply toothed, and usually dark green), make the bush easily recognisable. The fruit is nearly oval with disk as prominent as in other stylosa forms, and bearing a short style-column after the petals fall. In flower the styles are usually free, and variable in the degree to which they protrude. R. leucochroa is one of the commonest roses throughout Devon and (apparently) Cornwall, but seems rare in other parts of England. Plants from the neighbourhood of Plymouth were thus named by Mr. Déséglise for Mr. Briggs many years ago. It is well described in Boreau’s “Flore du centre de la France.”—W. Moyle Rogers.


Pyrus torminalis, Ehrh., var. Rocks, Aberedw, Radnorshire, 17th July, 1888. This is a deeply-cut variety, which may, perhaps, be worth sending. I only found a small tree or bush growing among abundance of P. rupicola, Syme. I believe P. torminalis, Ehrh., to be a new County record for Radnor.—Augustin Levy. “Scarcely a variety.”—Ed. “Do.”—J. G. Baker. “I should be content to name without adding ‘var.,’ for the deep cutting of the leaves is hardly, I think, a sufficiently marked feature to permit us to designate this plant a variety.”—T. R. Archer Briggs. One of the trees in Wychwood has leaves nearly as deeply incised.—Ed.

P. scandica, Syme? Craig Breiddin, Montgomeryshire, June, 1888. I send this as not representing typical scandica, but as one of the intermediates between this and P. Aria, Sm., which I do not know which species to place to. A form very similar to this, from the Dowards, Herefordshire, but a step nearer to P. Aria, was named for me P. Aria, a few years ago, by Dr. Boswell, with the remark that he had never seen the leaves of the side-shoots in Aria so deeply lobed. I found but one shrub of this variety on Craig Breiddin.—Augustin Levy. “Is not this Aria?”—J. G. Baker. “This has some of the characters of scandica, and seems to me Aria towards scandica, i.e., an intermediate form.”—Arthur Bennett. “P. latifolia, Syme.”—C. C. Babington. “Certainly is not P. scandica; it is much nearer P. latifolia, Syme, which latter he at one time thought to be the scandica of continental botanists. Vide ‘Rep. B. E. Club,’ 1872–1874, pp.
However, I would name this specimen not *P. latifolia*, but *P. Aria*. The leaves are not enough lobed for those of *P. latifolia*. I have both species in cultivation in my grounds here, and have found *P. latifolia* come quite true from seeds of wild bushes."—T. R. Archer Briggs. An almost identical specimen from the Ickleton road, Oxon, was named *Aria* by Dr. Boswell. See 'Fl. Oxf.', p. 114.—Ed.


*S. rivularis*, L. Corrie Sneachda, Easterness, July, 1888.—G. C. Druce.


*S. quinqueflida*, Haworth. Ben Laoigh, Argyle, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce. Also mountain cliffs, Hatterel, Herefordshire, 19th June, 1888.—Augustin Ley. Sent as *S. sponhemica*, Gmel., a name antedated by that of Haworth. Prof. Engler writes me he now considers *S. quinqueflida* as good a species as *S. hirsuta*.—Ed.


*R. rubrum*, L., var. *spicatum* (Robson). Uig, Ske, August, 1888.—W. R. Linton. A very interesting plant, which appears worthy of specific distinction.—Ed.


*Drosera anglica*, Huds., var. *ovovata*, Mert. et Koch. Sligachan, Skye, 6th August, 1888.—W. R. and E. F. Linton. Prof. Lawson told me in several districts of Skye this was the prevailing form. It is very abundant in some districts of the neighbouring mainland of West Ross.—Ed. Base of Ben Laoigh, Argyle, Co. 98, and Mid-Perth 88.—G. C. Druce. New County records.


Epilobium montanum, L. Form. Garden weed, Malvern Link, Worcestershire, 29th June, 1888. This form having the leaves in threes, though not at all rare, occurred in an unusual quantity in an uncultivated garden. With it were also plants with alternate leaves, and one root showed examples of stems respectively having leaves singly, in twos and in threes.—R. F. Towndrow. Also from Unwell Wood, Berks.—G. C. Druce. It is the so-called var. verticillatum of Koch in 'Flor. Germ.' p. 265, and 'Sturm. Fl.' 17, 72, 1838, and more fully described in Haussknecht's 'Monographie der Gattung Epilobium,' 1884, p. 75; "i. verticillata: foliis ternatis rarius quaternis, floralibus alternantibus." I saw a specimen at Aberfeldy, Mid-Perth, this year.—Ed.


E. montanum, L. monstrosity. A form with very small flowers, and the flower stalks much branched, probably from an aphis, with which it was infested. Den of Lawers, Mid-Perth, and Dalmally, Argyll, August, 1888. Also a large much branched form with purple flowers from same localities, which Prof. Haussknecht passed as montanum.—G. C. Druce.


E. obscurum × palustre. Dalmally, Argyll; teste Haussknecht; August, 1888.—G. C. Druce.

E. obscurum, Schreb. × palustre, L. Brailsford, S. Derbyshire, September, 1888. I am doubtful about this plant, and think it to be a form of obscurum only.—W. R. Linton. Passed by Mons. Barbey.

E. Lamyi, Schultz. Hort., Bangor. Seeds from Mr. Towndrow, Malvern.—J. E. Griffith. Mons. Barbey does not include this in the list of specimens which he passes as correct. He may have overlooked it.—Ed.

E. palustre, L., var. lineare (Krause), Hausskn. Headingtonwick, Oxon., July, 1885. Boat of Garten, Easterness, August, 1888. Haussknecht describes it, l.c., p. 130, as "d. angustifolia: fol. 2–3 m.m. latis, varia longitudine, venis destitutis vel vix indicatis."—G. C. Druce.

E. anagallidifolium, Lamk. (1786). Ben Laoigh, Argyle, Co. 98, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce. Prof. Haussknecht quotes as a synonym of this plant, E. repens; 'Hill's Brit. Herbal,' 1756, an ante-binomial work; and adopts Lamarck's name. He rejects the Linnaean name of alpinum as dubious, as he also does E. tetragonum with greater reason. If such a name as E. alpinum be discarded, how few of the Linnaean names would be retained!—Ed.
**Ludwigia palustris**, Elliott. New Forest, S. Hants, July, 1881.—
G. C. DRUCE.


*C. alpina*, L., var. *intermedia*, Ehrh.—Wastdale Head, Cumberland, August, 1888.—H. E. Fox. “Yes.”—Mons. Barbey. Wood, Aberedw, Radnorshire, July 17th, 1888.—AUGUSTIN LEY. “*C. alpina*, L.”—Mons. Barbey. The specimens were mixed; one or two appeared to be var. *intermedia*, Ehrh.—Ed.

**Bupleurum rotundifolium**, L. Wootton, Berks, August, 1886.—
G. C. DRUCE.

**Trinia vulgaris**, DC. St. Vincent’s Rocks, Gloster, W., August, 1887.—G. C. DRUCE.

**Archangelica officinalis**, Hoffm. A weed in my garden, Kersal Cottage, Prestwich, Manchester, the last fourteen years, September, 1888.—J. COSMO MELVILLE.

**Peucedanum officinale**, L. Whitstable, Kent, September, 1888.—
G. C. DRUCE.


**G. anglicum**, Huds. Near Brandon, Norfolk, July, 1881.—G. C. DRUCE.

**Erigeron alpinum**, L. Glen Doile, Forfar, August, 1881.—G. C. DRUCE.

**Inula salicina**, L. Root from Lough Derg. Unluckily the plant persists in flowering during my summer holiday, and the specimens were dried by my gardener, consequently are not all I could wish.—E. F. LINTON.

**Achillea nobilis**, L. Established many years on waste ground near Kingswood, Bristol, 14th August, 1888.—J. WALTER WHITE. The true plant, known from *Milkefolium* by the leaf, “rachi angusta ab apice ad medium folii dentata;” whereas in *Milkefolium* “rachi integra vel in apice folii subdentata.”—Ed.


**Chrysanthemum corymbosum**, L. On the quay, Bangor, September, 1888.—J. E. GRIFFITH. The discoid form looking very much like *Tanacetum boreale*.—Ed. Mr. Arthur Bennett says “he believes it is correct.”

**Matricaria maritima**, L. Root from Sutherland, by Rev. E. Marshall, Hort. Croydon.—ARTHUR BENNETT.

**Senecio Jacobea**, L., var. *flosculosus* (Jord.). Banna sandhills, Kerry, July, 1888.—R. W. SCULLY. S. F. Gray is a much earlier authority for the varietal name than Jordan, who, moreover, I believe, described it as a species.—Ed.

Common, Warwickshire, August, 1888.—H. Bromwich. Specimens too imperfect, lacking, as they did, the especial portions necessary for the identification of the variety.—Ed.

Carduus nutans × crispus. Hedge, Sellack, Herefordshire, September, 1888.—Augustin Ley. "Is not the plant of Syme or Watson, which is exactly halfway between the two; this is very near crispus."—Arthur Bennett. Is much nearer crispus than the plant sent from St. Weonards by Mr. Ley, in 1883, which was even nearer nutans than the hybrid to which Mr. Watson gave the name Newbouldi.—Ed.

C. crispus, L., acaanthoides (L.). Woods, Symonds Yat, W. Gloster, 13th October, 1888—Augustin Ley. "Yes."—J. G. Baker. I should hardly have called this acaanthoides. It seems a remarkable form of crispus, showing no nutans parentage.—Ed. "Judging by specimens gathered near Croydon, and named "C. crispus, var. lentiginosus = C. acaanthoides, Bab., 'Man.' by H. C. Watson, and assest to by Dr. Boswell, I should say certainly not acaanthoides. I should call it, as Prof Babington does, a weak form of crispus. It has just the appearance that specimens have that have been "cut over," in trimming hedge banks, and afterwards throwing out autumnal flowering shoots."—Arthur Bennett. "It seems a remarkable form of crispus."—C. C. Babington.

Cirsium arvensis × palustris. Wood, Holm Lacey, Herefordshire, October, 1888.—Augustin Ley. I have seen the same form in Oxford, see 'Fl. Ox.,' p. 174, and consider it a lax form of palustris, at any rate it is not Cirsium arvensi × palustre of Naegeli, which has the closely aggregated anthodes of type palustris.—Ed. "This may not be identical with Naegeli's plant, so named, yet I believe it a hybrid. I have a nearly similar plant from Mitcham Common, Surrey, except that my specimen has much more spinous-armed peduncles than this."—Arthur Bennett.

Annseris pusilla, Gærtn. Lakenheath, Suffolk, W., July, 1881.—G. C. Druce.

Crepis laraxactifolia, Thuill. Wolvercote, Oxon., July, 1885.—G. C. Druce.


H. pratense, Tausch. Between Haddington and Longniddry, Co. Haddington, 30th June, 1888. New county record. As I pointed out some time ago the plant is likely to be found in various localities on the East side of the Island.—A. Craig-Christie.


Hieracium gracilentum, Backh. Glen Ennich, Easterness, August, 1887; teste F. J. Hanbury.—G. C. Druce. New County record.

H. globosum, Backh., Glen Ennich, Easterness, August, 1887; teste F. J. Hanbury.—G. C. Druce. New County record.

H. lingulatum, Backh. Corrie Ceander, S. Aberdeen, August, 1887.—G. C. Druce. Also Altnacaillich Burn, Sutherlandshire, July, 1888.—J. Cosmo Melvill. From the specimens being sent out without labels attached, either to the plants or sheet, I am afraid specimens of this and nitidum will require checking; at least Mr. Hanbury tells me his were transposed. Mine appear to be right. —Ed.

H. chrysanthum, Backh. Glen Ennich, Easterness, teste F. J. Hanbury, August, 1887.—G. C. Druce.


H. anglicum, Fries. Settle, Yorkshire, 2nd to 14th July, 1888. Last year I sent specimens labelled H. anglicum var. cerinthiforme, and they were passed as correct by Mr. Hanbury. Last year Mr. Hanbury and I were shown specimens of the true cerinthiforme gathered by the late Mr. J. Tatham in Scotland, preserved in his herbarium, and we then saw it was quite a different plant from the Settle one, having a very leafy stem; these specimens are therefore sent as corrections.—W. H. Painter. "Correct."—F. J. Hanbury. Also from banks of River Rushill, Glenartney, Perthshire, August, 1888.—J. Cosmo Melvill. "Correct."—F. J. H.


H. pallidum, Biv., var. crinigerum. Rocks, Aberedw, Radnorshire, 17th July, 1888. New County record. This has been seen by Dr. Lindeberg, through Mr. Hanbury’s kindness, and Dr. Lindeberg’s remark was "Cum planta originali bene convenit."—Augustin Ley. Also from limestone rock, Gt. Doward, Herefordshire, 11th June, 1888, confirmation of County record; and Craig Breidden, Montgomeryshire, June, 1888; both collected by Augustin Ley.

H. pallidum, Biv., var. Limestone, Gt. Doward, Herefordshire, 11th June, 1888. I think this must be the H. stenolepis mentioned by Mr. Hanbury in ‘Journ. Bot.,’ July, 1885, p. 205. It was not, however, picked at the same station as the Herefordshire plant there mentioned; and I do not feel sure of its identity with that plant.—Augustin Ley. Also Pontesbury Hill, Salop, 29th June, 1888.—John Fraser. This and the var. crinigerum in preceding paragraph Mr. Hanbury marks as H. lasiophyllum, Koch, but "he is not prepared to say how far these two names are synonymous; but the Salop plant is certainly the same as the one from Craig Breidden, Gt. Doward Hill, and Radnorshire, to which the name H. lasiophyllum, Koch, has been applied by competent authorities."
Hieracium pollinarium, F. J. Hanb. Steep sea cliffs overhanging the road between Betty Hill and Farr Bay, Sutherlandshire (only four plants gathered), July, 1888.—J. Cosmo Melvill.


H. orarium, Lindb. Sunny flowery bank, overhanging the estuary of the River Naver, below Betty Hill Inn, Sutherlandshire, 30th July, 1888.—J. Cosmo Melvill and W. R. Linton. "H. orarium, var. fide, Dr. C. J. Lindeberg. Observe the very pilose tips to the ligules, which character helps to separate the species from H. vulgatum, Fries. I have had this Sutherland plant under cultivation for two years, and find that under these circumstances it closely approximates to the normal Scandinavian type of the species."—F. J. Hanbury.

H. Friesii, Hartm. Uig, Isle of Skye, 13th August, 1888. This plant differs in size and number of heads from typical H. Friesii. It is the prevalent form about Uig, but the type also occurs quite sparingly.—W. R. Linton.
Hieracium crosatum, Fr. By the Rothay, Grasmere, Westmoreland, August, 1888.—H. E. Fox.

H. pulchellum, Lindb., var. vestitum. Unst, Shetland Isles, 16th August, 1886.—W. R. Linton. So named by Dr. Lindeberg.

H. auratum, Fries., Mon. p. 181. Uig, Isle of Skye, August, 1888.—W. R. Linton. “Yes”—F. J. Hanbury. Pointed out to me by Mr. Hanbury, near Lawers, Mid-Perth. It was also abundant in meadows at head of Loch Awe, near Dalmally, Argyll. New County record.—Ed.

H. sparsifolium, Lindeb. Uig, Isle of Skye, 9th of August, 1888. This has been found in Britain previous to my discovery of it in Skye. The credit of the naming is due to Mr. Hanbury.—W. R. Linton. Also unnamed from rocks, Blaen, Taffawr, Breconshire, August, 1888; and débris of slate quarries, Bethesda, Carnarvonshire, August, 1888.—Augustin Ley.

Taraxacum officinale, Lamk., var. erythrospermum (Andrz.). Sandy common, near sea, Seaton Carew, July, 1887.—H. E. Fox. “This seems the plant usually so named in Britain, but I believe the name has been denied as representing the plant of the continent, so called.”—Arthur Bennett.

Lactuca saligna, L. Whitstable, Kent, September, 1888.—G. C. Druce.


Campanula rotundifolia, L., var. lancifolia, Koch. Cliffs, Carnedd Dafydd, Carnarvon, 21st August, 1888.—Augustin Ley. Dr. Schönland was kind enough to examine these and the following specimens with me. We find it impossible to separate the foregoing from the type plant.—Ed.

C. rotundifolia, L., var. Lime rocks, Carreg Cennin, Carmarthen, 6th September, 1888.—Augustin Ley. These specimens were not all from the same variety. Some of them well match the var. lancifolia, Koch, the description of which is here appended: “folia caulina inferiora bipolaricia 3-4 lineas lata, superiora sensim breviora et angustiora.” ‘Fl. Germ.,’ 2,538 (1844). Koch gives as a synonym the var. reniformis, Pers.: “major, fol. radicalibus pluribus eniformibus persistentibus, caul. sparsis oblongo lanceolatus in petiolum decurrentibus.” ‘Syn.,’ vol. i. p. 188 (1805). Dr. Schönland has been good enough to translate for me the following descriptions of varieties of C. rotundifolia from A. Vocke and C. Angelbrodt’s ‘Flora von Nordhausen,’ Berlin, 1886. “(a) uniflora, Hampe. Stem simple, stiff, one-flowered; leaves, linear. On sunny slopes and sandy soil. (b) elongata, Hampe. Stem elongated, length up to 0.50 m. [I have seen it nearly 1 m. long; S. Schönland], leaves elongated, linear-lanceolate, radical leaves usually wanting. On gypsum rocks. (c) cespitosa, Hampe. Stem cespitose, ascending, about as long as the finger; almost always with three flowers; stem-leaves linear. On sunny slopes. (d) hirta, Mert.
et Koch. The lower part of plant covered with stiff hairs. On sunny slopes. (e) lancifolia, Koch (C. Baumgarteni, Beck.). Lower stem-leaves up to 0.05 m. in length, and 0.01 m. in breadth, the upper ones gradually shorter and narrower. On gypsum rocks.” Care must be taken in examining specimens of C. rotundifolia not to mistake the leaves of the barren shoots for those of the flowering stems, to the latter of which the above descriptions alone apply.—Ed.

Vaccinium intermedium, Ruthe. Cannock Chase, Staffordshire, August, 1888.—Geo. Nicholson. This was first made known and figured as a British plant by R. Garner, F.L.S., in 3 Science Gossip,’ March 7th, 1872, in a “note on a hybrid Vaccinium between Bilberry and Cranberry.”—Ed.


Ex herb.—W. R. Linton.

Erica ciliaris, I. Wareham, Dorset, August, 1888. Ex herb.—J. Cosmo Melvill.

Pyrola rotundifolia, L. Ben Laoigh, Argyll, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce.—New County record.

Hypopitys Monotropa, Crantz. Mongewell, Oxon, July, 1884.—G. C. Druce.

Armeria plantaginea, Willd. St. Ouen’s Bay, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.


Cynoglossum germanicum, Jacq. Wychword Forest, Oxon, June, 1884.—G. C. Druce.


M. arvensis, Hoffm., var. Hoy, Orkney Isles, August, 1886; and Reay, Caithness, July, 1888. On specimens from the Orkney Isles submitted to him, Prof. Lange wrote “Var. calycis lobis in statu frutiferi erectis.” The Caithness plant appears to be exactly similar, with the same deeply divided calyx and large corolla.—W. R. Linton. On the Caithness specimen Mr. J. G. Baker queries “Is not this sylvatica?” “The specimens sent to me are arvensis!”.—Arthur Bennett. I should say my specimens are lax arvensis, but our Myosotis sadly want working. A plant referred to in ‘Fl. Oxon.’ has been called M. caspitoosa, M. palustris, M. repens, and var. strigulosa! Willdenow
described this as *M. arvensis*, in 1787, but he quotes *M. annua* of Moench as synonymous.—Ed.


*Minimus guttatus*, DC. Streamside by Reay Sandhills, Caithness, July, 1888.—J. Cosmo Melvill. It occurs also in West Ross, by Kintail, and is scarcely distinct from *M. luteus*, L.—Ed.


*E. officinalis*, L., var. Yeldersley, S. Derbyshire, September, 1888.—W. R. Linton. Mr. F. Townsend’s remarks on these specimens will appear in next year’s Report.

*Bartsia alpina*, L. Teesdale, S. Durham, July, 1881; and Ben Laoigh, Argyll, July, 1888.—G. C. Druce.

*Melampyrum pratense*, L., var. hians, mihi. Abundant along the Findhorn, to the exclusion of the ordinary form, for seven or eight miles, Elgin, August, 1888. The flowers always of the same bright golden yellow colour, the tint of which I hoped to preserve, but they have terribly blackened in drying. I believe I saw the same variety (from the train), near Grantown, in Easterness.—G. C. Druce. I see in ‘Fl. Salop,’ Mr. Jorden is quoted for the record in the Forest of Wyre of varieties with orange and yellow flowers [of *M. pratense*], occupying distinct and extensive habitats.

*M. pratense*, L., form. Thickets near Dunbeath, Caithness, 25th July, 1888. This plant was so hairy in its upper parts that I took it, at first, for *M. ericetorum*. The hirsuteness, however, in my plant is much softer, and does not cover the stem and branches to the same extent as in *M. ericetorum*, Oliver. The Rev. W. R. Linton has come across the same hairy form as the Dunbeath plant, in Derbyshire.—E. F. Linton.

*M. pratense*, L., hispid form. Marsh, Boat of Garten, Easterness, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce. “These northern forms are interesting, but neither is the var. ericetorum, D. Oliv., I believe.”—C. C. Babington. Mr. D. Oliver describes his var. ericetorum as follows:—“Plant frequently equally large with *M. pratense*, and often coarser and stronger; flowers axillary, secund, in approximate or subdistant pairs; bracts varying from lanceolate, ovate-lanceolate to ovate, frequently (in large specimens generally) with one, two, or three teeth, directed forwards or divergent. Entire plant more or less hispid . . . . . leaves lanceolate or linear-lanceolate, under side reticulated; flower large; tube of corolla mostly, in the open flower, straw-coloured or white . . . . . The pale or white tube of the corolla, although in itself trifling, is very general, and immediately attracts attention to the plant.” Mr. Oliver observed no “specimens in the West of Ireland referable to typical *M. pratense*, or in any way different from the plant just described.” ‘Phytologist,’ 1852, p. 678. The plants sent by the Revs. E. F. and W. R. Linton are not identical.
with my Roundstone specimens, which are more thickly covered with longer and stiffer hairs (so as to become almost asperous) than the Scotch plants. Messrs. Linton do not refer to the colour of the flower. In marshy ground, near the Boat of Garten, in Easterness, occurred plants with pale flowers, tube white and much hairier than the Caithness plants, which I am inclined to refer to var. ericetorum, although not absolutely identical with the Irish plant. It should be borne in mind that Dr. Johnston, when he described his M. montanum, said “the stem was hispid. Leaves hairy all over.” Gaudin, in ‘Fl. Helv.,’ vol. iv., p. 122 (1829), describes a variety of M. pratense as “minor, foliiis lanceolato-linearibus,” and calls it var. paludosa. He gives Sturm’s ‘Fl. Germ.,’ vol. i., fasc. 9, tab. 11, as a good figure of it. This must be very near Johnston’s plant.—Ed.


_Mentha alopecuroides_, Hull. Harling to Larling, Norfolk, W., 3rd October, 1888. In a situation which cannot be said to be quite free from suspicion, as the mint grew in a damp corner of a field, near cottages. But, I think, in Norfolk this mint is taken from the marsh into the cottage garden (and there known as “Lamb’s mint”), and then may become an outcast before losing any of its wildness. My locality was on the border of a very marshy district.—E. F. Linton.

It is not included in ‘Kirby Trimmer’s Flora,’ although given in ‘Student’s Flora’ for Norfolk.—Ed. “In his very full account of the Norfolk mints in the supplement to his Norfolk Flora (1884), Mr. Trimmer gives nine stations for this mint. I myself have no doubt it is really a native of Norfolk in some stations.”—Arthur Bennett.

_M. pubescens_, Willd. Hort., Croydon, 1888.—ARTHUR BENNETT.

“See l’Abbe Strail’s note on this in last ‘Report,’ the same plant from the same roots!”—Arthur Bennett.

_Mentha_ ——. Damp hollows in Ainsdale, and Freshfield Sandhills, W. Lancashire, September, 1881.—J. Cosmo Melvill.

“Echantillon incomplet.”—l’Abbe Strail.

_M. gracilis_, Sole (et Smith). Shotover, Oxford, September, 1888. —G. C. Druce. See ‘Report,’ 1887, p. 187, where the Abbé Strail identifies it with the _M. gracilis_, Sole (et Smith), dwelling especially on the subulate plumose calyx teeth, and lanceolate leaves, as the characters which distinguish it from _gentilis_. On seeing l’Abbé Strail’s determination I sent fresh specimens to Mr. Baker, who writes “I feel pretty sure this is the wild original type of _cardiaca_, the variegated form of which is so common in gardens. I see _cardiaca_ is recorded from Woodstock by Syme. We have a good many of Sole’s Mints in the herbarium, but they are not named (by him) in accordance with the names in his book. It is very interesting.”

It may be well, since there is a confusion in authority, to go thoroughly into this matter, and, as Sole’s ‘Mentha,’ published in 1798, is rather an inaccessible book to many botanists, to give a précis of his views. _M. cardiaca_ (of Smith) is figured and described as _M. gentilis_, _M. fioribus verticillatis, bracteis longis acuminatis sessilibus, caule erecto ramoso fusco; foliiis oblongo
subpetiolatis serratis glabrioribus, nervis fuscis, staminibus corolla lanceolatis brevioribus; ocymi odore = M. cardiaca, Ger., p. 680, M. gentilis, Huds., p. 252. Sole, p. 35.

*Menica gracilis*, Sole. M. floribus verticillatis, verticillis paucioribus ac minoribus, foliis petiolatis ovato-lanceolatis serratis, subhirsutis, nervis albis pilosis, caule erecto piloso suffruticoso exalbido rubescente subramoso, ramulis brevibus erectis, staminibus corolla brevioribus; ocymi odore grato. The whirls of flowers are fewer and smaller than in [cardiaca], the leaves stand on footstalks, are of a long ovate pointed shape, a little hairy and serrated; the nerves are white; it has an agreeable aromatic minty smell. It differs from the foregoing in having no smell of Basil, and the floral leaves are broader and stand on footstalks, whereas in the former they are sessile and very narrow, merely bracteals, nor has it the least resemblance to spear mint, which [cardiaca] has, p. 38.

Smith, in F1. Br., 622, 1800, and Eng. Fl., Vol. 3, 1824, groups true gracilis, cardiaca, and pratensis under the aggregate name of gracilis. The var. a. gracilis, Sole, “gaudet odore M. viridis” with a reference to the “M. verticillata glabra odore M. sativae,” in Herb. Sherard. Var. b., M. pratensis, Sole, “gaudet odore M. piperita,” var. c., M. cardiaca, Gerard, “gaudet odore ocyum.” With a reference to “M. verticill, odore ocyum,” Morison’s Hist. Ox. “The leaves accompanying the whisrs in var. c. are very much smaller than the rest.” Fortunately in the Sherard Herb. at Oxford the specimens referred to as Smith’s var. gracilis are still preserved. One of them was collected by Dale (who gave the name quoted above), at Bocking. It has the name “gracilis Sm. Eng. Fl.” written in pencil on the sheet. The other specimen, probably one of Rand’s, from Stoke Newington, is labelled by Sibthorp M. gentilis, which it appears clearly allied to. These agree fairly well with Sole’s description (which does not altogether match his plate), and with Smith’s description. The plant in Morison’s ‘Hist. Ox.’ referred to as cardiaca by Smith is also in existence at Oxford in Herb. Morison, and fairly well matches the Shotover plant, which widely differs from Smith’s gracilis from Bocking, as will be seen from the following descriptions I have drawn up. M. gracilis, stem smooth, nearly simple; leaves smooth, light green, shortly stalked; floral leaves large, the upper two pairs without flowers; veins of leaves white; hairs on calyx, principally confined to margin, straight, and rather slender. It has the look of sativa. The Stoke Newington plant is not identical. The var. cardiaca, which agrees with our Shotover plant, may be thus characterised: leaves profusely glandular, with red veins, thicker in texture, often purplish in colour, gradually diminishing in size, until the upper bracts scarcely exceed the verticillasters; calyx covered with stiffer falcate hairs; stems repeatedly branched, thinly clothed with shaggy hairs. The plant has somewhat the aspect of M. viridis, of which it possesses the odour to a marked extent, in this respect only agreeing with Smith’s gracilis. The Shotover plant we must therefore call M. cardiaca (Ger.), Baker. Having in mind the Sherardian specimen of M. gracilis, I should not be inclined to think that it has any connection with our cardiaca save
in its glabrous pedicels. It is closely allied to \textit{M. gentilis}, L. (non Sm.) Our \textit{cardiaca} suggests a hybrid of \textit{M. rubra} and \textit{M. viridis}. I believe I am right in assuming that the Abbé Strail considers that \textit{M. gracilis}, Sm., and \textit{M. cardiaca} are synonymous, but, probably, he has not had the opportunity of seeing Smith's specimens.—Ed.

\textit{Origanum} \textit{megastachyum}, Link. Amongst brambles under the walls of Carisbrooke Castle, 6th October, 1888. In a marshy meadow, growing in a dense patch at the upper end of the valley, Rowridge; also on the downs at Apesdown, Rowridge, and Bowcombe, 8th October, 1888. All in the Isle of Wight, where it is common, and where it passes insensibly into the typical form of \textit{O. vulgare}. The bracts of the plant on the downs are of a rich maroon or dark chocolate colour; but the form which grows upon the hill which is crowned by Carisbrooke Castle has the spikes long and lax, and the bracts are of a light green shade, the uppermost ones being tipped with red. The Carisbrooke plant has the leaves attenuated at the base, not rounded as in the plant of the downs, and it is this character, along with the green bracts, which probably led to \textit{Origanum} \textit{virens}, Link et Hoff., being included in the 3rd edition of the 'London Catalogue,' as mentioned on page 263, Townsend's 'Flora of Hampshire.'—CHARLES BAILEY. \textit{O. vulgare}, L., var. \textit{prismaticum}, Gaud.; passed without comment by l'Abbé Strail.—Ed.

\textit{Nepeta} \textit{Cataria}, Linn. On the crest of Bowcombe Down, Isle of Wight, 8th October, 1888. Confined to a very restricted area, pointed out to me by our former member, Mr. Frederick Stratton, and the only station in the Isle of Wight known to him. Mr. Townsend, however, gives other stations besides the above in his 'Flora,' p. 251.—CHARLES BAILEY.

\textit{Stachys} \textit{germanica}, L. Witney, Oxon, July, 1885. Locality given in Johnson's 'Gerarde.'—G. C. DUCHE.


\textit{Galeopsis} \textit{dubia}, Leers. In a cornfield at Vodol Farm, near Bangor, 8th August, 1888.—J. E. GRIFFITH. "Yes."—J. G. Baker.


\textit{Ajuga} \textit{pyramidalis}, L. Berriedale, Caithness, 21st July, 1888.—W. K. LINTON.

\textit{Plantago} \textit{intermedia}, Gilib. This plant grows plentifully upon the muddy shores of Knypersley Reservoir, where also several forms of \textit{major} are to be seen, July, 1888.—W. H. PAINTER. "Yes."—J. G. Baker. Properly reduced to a variety of \textit{P. major}, L.—Ed.

\textit{P. arenaria}, Waldst. et Kit. Old gravel pit, Beckenham, Kent, 1888.—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY.


\textit{Atriplex} \textit{hastata}, Huds., var.? \textit{triangularis}? or is it the subspecies
**Deltoidea?** A set of this species, sent on the chance of its being what is required by the Club. The seeds are of two kinds, larger brown, and smaller black, both smooth and shining, the latter more numerous. Old gravel pit, Beckenham, Kent, September, 1888.—Eyre de Crespiigny. *Deltoidea*, Bab., with rather more hastate leaves than our Thames-side plant.—Ed. "Is *A. deltoidea*, Bab."—Arthur Bennett. New record for Vice-county 16.


*P. maculatum*, Dyer and Trim., var. inanum, Willd. and Sum., p.p. If not Willdenow's plant, an uncommon form of *maculatum*. The under surfaces of the leaves are nearly white. On clay soil, overlying gravel border of a field and roadside, Beckenham, Kent.—Eyre de Crespiigny. Willdenow's *inanum* is generally quoted as a variety of *Persicaria*, which is all that the above plant is. It has nothing to do with *maculatum*.—Ed. "Surely not *maculatum*."—Arthur Bennett.


*Rumex scutatus*, L. Old walls, near Settle, Yorks., Co. 64, 30th June, 1888.—R. F. and F. P. Thompson.

*Urtica dioica*, L. angustifolia, A. Blytt. Little Birch, Herefordshire, 12th August, 1888. I wish to state that the plant sent under this name grew under rather abnormal conditions in a bushy ditch, where it was much shaded by other herbage. The leaves in plants apparently from same roots varied greatly in width, and in the length of their petioles, the latter, however being always abnormally long.—Augustin Ley. "Yes," J. G. Baker. Also from Tachbrook, Warwickshire, July, 1888.—H. Bromwich. The Warwick specimens are useless for critical discrimination, as the lower leaves are absent. In Decandolle's *'Prodromus* Weddell gives under *U. dioica*, a var. *angustifolia*, Ledeb. *Fl. Alt.*, p. 240, 1829-1833, *Fl. Ross.* 3, p. 637. "Caulibus clatis puberulis glabratissimis sepius inermibus, foliis ovato vel oblongo-lanceolatis lanceolatisve basi acutis aut rotundatis grosse et argute serratis v. subincisis utrinque at preāsīrīm subītus scabrusculo-hispidis rarissimeque stimulosis, perignonio fructiferō hispidulo," which was originally described as a species by Fischer, ex Hornemann Hort. reg. bot. Hafniensis, Supp. p. 107, 1819. Ledebour simply describes it as "foliis oblongo lanceolatis" in *Fl. Ross.*, vol. iii., p. 637; 1846-51. Ledebour, therefore, has the prior claim to the use of the varietal name. In the 'Norge Flora,' p. 145, it is described as "uden Broeendhaar og med lange smale, lancetformede, ei ved grunden negerde blade," with a reference to 'Vegetationsforholdene ved Sognefjorden, 1869.' The Hereford specimens appear to belong to the var. *atrovires*, Gren. et Godr., 'Fl. Fr.,' vol. iii., p. 108. "Feuilles ovales et même suborbiculaires inférieurement, à dents plus profondes, à pétiole plus long et presque
égal au limbe, à poils peu nombreux et plus gros, plus renflés à la base, ainsi que cela se voit aussi sur la tige ; stipules plus larges = U. atrovirens, Requien. exs.”—Ed. “Mr. Ley’s plant is certainly not the var. of Blytt. It is almost identical with var. subinermis, Uechtritz, forma tenusfolia, differing only in the hairs of the stem being shorter than in type specimens of the plant of Uechtritz. Blytt, in his ‘Om Vegetationsforholdene ved Sognefjorden,’ p. 108, doubtfully refers his v. angustifolia to the var. b. holosericea, Hartm. These are different from Rev. A. Ley’s plant. Mr. Bromwich’s plant may be nearer Blytt’s, but it is impossible to name such examples of critical plants. There is another form of dioica that I have not seen from Britain yet, f. glabra, Hartm.; this has leaves 4–6 inches long, by 1½–2 inches broad, without the petiole, pale green leaves, paler beneath, and with the veins whitish green, very conspicuous, and of very thin texture.”—Arthur Bennett.

Urtica dioica, L., var. parvifolia. Canal-side, Oxford, September, 1888.—G. C. Druce. This appears to be the var. microphylla, Hausm., in Vocke et Angel, ‘Flora Nordhaus,’ but on referring to Hausmann’s original description in ‘Fl. von Tyrol,’ 1852, it states that his plant is 6 or 7 feet high. It is not the microphylia of ‘Baenitz herb.’ which appears to be a lapsus calami for macrophyilla. Our variety is characterised by its small leaves and more branching habit, and is probably a starved form.—Ed. “The size named would not exclude it from Hausmann’s plant. Mr. Druce’s plant is really very like that of Hausmann, differing only by the sharper serration of the leaves. I see no other difference than this between it and an authentic specimen from Herr von Uechtritz of Hausmann’s variety.”—Arthur Bennett.


B. ——. W. alpine slopes, 1,500 feet, Ben Hope, Sutherland, July, 1888.—J. Cosmo Melvill.

Salix alopecuroides, Tausch. (fragilis × triandra). St. Neots, Hunts, 17th May, 1888.—W. R. Linton. “In the absence of mature leaves, I can see nothing in this to separate it from S. triandra, L. It is not the same as a plant formerly gathered (in the same locality) by Mr. Linton, which has some claim to be considered S. alopecuroides, Tausch.”—Dr. F. Buchanan-White.


S. triandra, L., ? var. Thames-side, above Putney, Surrey, Sep-
tember, 1888.—Eyre de CrespiGny. Also named on label S. triandra, L. ? var. ? contorta. The leaves are green on both sides, and the catkins paler, wanting, as do also the leaves, the yellow tinge of colour noticeable in the typical form; moreover the scales are pubescent, as in undulata, but in a less degree; and they are not nearly so silky; the young shoots are furrowed, as in Crowe's contorta. Is it Trevirani, Spr.? I have never met with any other form of triandra by the Thames-side but the above, and the hybrid undulata, which is frequent enough.—Eyre de CrespiGny. "The young fruiting catkins are clearly S. undulata, Ehrh; the foliage is not so typical, the leaves tapering less than usual in my specimen; but the shoots supplied are weak, subsidiary branchlets, without a developed stipule."—E. F. Linton. "A mixture of specimens. The leaf specimens belong to S. triandra, L. The flowers to S. lanceolata, Sm. Too great care cannot be taken to make certain that leaves and flowers are taken from the same bush."—Dr. Buchanan-White.

S. lanceolata, Sm., is a synonym, I believe, of S. undulata, Ehrh. —Ed.


S. purpurea, L., var. Turvey, Bed., April, September, 1888.—W. R. Linton. Also Elstree, Middlesex, April, July, 1885.—"Are S. rubra, Huds., var. purpureoides, Gr. et Godr. S. rubra being a hybrid between S. purpurea and S. viminalis, frequently shows affinity with one rather than the other of its parents. These specimens exhibit greater resemblance to S. purpurea than to S. viminalis, but they are not such extreme forms as, e.g., well developed S. Forbyana, which also belongs to the var. purpureoides."—Dr. F. Buchanan-White.

S. viminalis, L., var. intricata. I wish to answer the question asked by Dr. F. B. White in the 'Report' for 1887, p. 189. The smaller leaved specimen from Wilton was certainly gathered from the same bush as the larger.—Augustin Ley.


S. cinerea, L., f. gynandra, and f. androgyna. Holme Fen, Hunts., May, 1888.—W. R. Linton. "Monstrosities, probably of S. cinerea, but, in the absence of leaves, the species must remain a little uncertain."—Dr. F. Buchanan White.

S. aurita, L., f. gynandra. Shirley, Derbyshire, 11th May—1st June, 1888.—W. R. Linton. "A monstrosity, probably of S. aurita; but the leaves are too young. Monstrosities of the catkins occur in almost all willows, but are not worthy of being distinguished by name. Mature leaves as well as flowers should always be sent."—Dr. F. Buchanan White. New record for County 57.

S. sphacelata, Sm. Near Settle, Yorks., Co. 64, July, 1888.—W. H. Painter. I suggested to Dr. F. B. White that this was only an exstipulate form of S. caprea with more entire leaves. He remarks
“A not unusual form of *S. caprea*, L., but not *S. sphacelata*, Sm.” Smith’s description in ‘Fl. Brit.’ is “Salix folis integerrimus ellipticis planis utrinque pubescentibus apice subsphacelatis, stipulis obsoletis, capsulis subulatis,” giving as a synonym, *S. lanata*, in herb. Lightfoot (non Linn.). The leaves are described as “uncia vel sesquiuncia apice plerumque sphacelata, fuscus. Amenta uncialia,” which shows it to be a starved alpine form of *S. caprea*.—Ed.

*Salix phylicifolia*, L., v. *Davalliana* (Sm.). Dunbeath, Caithness, July, 1888. And var. *Borreriana* (Sm.). Lybster, Caithness.—W. R. LINTON. “Are *S. phylicifolia*, L.”—Dr. F. Buchanan White. I believe Dr. White is of opinion that the varieties of *phylicifolia* are not worthy of being retained.—Ed.

*S. repens*, L., b. *fusca*. In a boggy corner of Hayes Common, near Keston, Kent, 1888.—ÉVRE DE CRESPIGNY. Also heathy road side, Honiley, Warwickshire, May, September, 1888.—H. BROMWICH. “*S. repens*, L. The varietal names in our lists of this and many other species must be abandoned.”—Dr. F. Buchanan White.

*Populus tremula*, L., *glabra*, Syme. Wotton-under-Edge, West Glostershire, May—July, 1888. New record for West Gloucester. The specimens are taken from both barren and fertile plants. In vice Co. 34 this variety is far more abundant than *villosa*.—J. WALTER WHITE.

*Juniperus nana*, Willd. Ben Hope, Sutherland, at 2,000 feet and upwards, 20th July, 1888.—J. COSMO MELVILL.

*Corallorhiza inata*, R. Br. Rescobie, Forfar, July, 1882.—G. C. DRUCE.


*C. pallens*, Rich. Goring, Oxon, June, 1887.—G. C. DRUCE.


*Iris foetidissima*, L., b. *citrina*, Syme. Rough high ground, behind Swanage, July, 1884. Now almost extinct there. In the earlier years it was much more widely spread, and more abundant. The colour, when growing, is a beautiful pale lemon.—ELIZABETH LOMAX. Beautiful specimens of a much desired plant. Its varietal name was originally given by Blomfield in ‘Flora Vectensis,’ and used by Syme in ‘E. B.’ without acknowledgment. It should be var. *citrina*, Blomfield.—Ed.

*Allium Scorodoprasum*, L. Mount Hasledon, Durham, July, 1887.—H. E. FOX.

*A. oleraceum*, L. Near Forres, Elgin. New County record, August, 1888.—G. C. DRUCE.

*Juncus*. “Forma intermedia *f. compressi* et *J. Gerardi*.”—Dr. Buchenau. Damp sands, near Berrow, North Somerset, 26th July, 1887.—J. WALTER WHITE. See ‘Journ. Bot.,’ February, 1889. Specimens equally difficult to refer to *compressus* or *Gerardi* are contained in the Dillenian herbarium collected “inter Greenwich et Woolwich.”—Ed.
**Juncus balticu**s, Wild. Sands of Barrie, Forfar, July, 1882.—G. C. Druce.

**J. supinus**, Mœnch., form. Betty Hill, Sutherland, August, 1888, growing in two feet depth of water, and varying in consequence, as it seems commonly to do in such situations.—W. F. Linton. “Near to var. uliginosus, Roth. But Buchenau does not admit any variety excepting our var. Kochii, Bab., the varying states which this species assumes, in common with, but to a greater extent than, several of the other species, being apparently induced by local circumstances, and not varieties properly speaking.”—W. H. Beeby.


**J. triglumis**, L. Ben Laoigh, Argyll, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce.


**Sparganium neglectum**, Beeby. Field pit in the neighbourhood of Golden Hill Fort, Freshwater, Isle of Wight, 11th October, 1888. Our new member, Captain Stuard, has sent me fruits from half a dozen other Isle of Wight stations, collected after I left the island, and all like the Golden Hill form.—Charles Bailey. “This is *S. ramosum*, var. *microcarpum*, Neumann, MS., a form which will, I believe, be described in the forthcoming new edition of ‘Hartmann’s Flora.’ This form is often mistaken for *neglectum*, to which, when the fruits of the latter are in a shrivelled or imperfect state, it bears some resemblance. Extended observations on this form convinced me long ago that it was a variety of *ramosum*, bearing very numerous fruits in each head, to which circumstance the modification in their shape seems to be due. I had intended to name it accordingly, but found that Dr. Neumann, who had gradually come to the same conclusion respecting the plant, had already done so.”—W. H. Beeby.

**Potamogeton natans**, L. Knypersley Park, Staffordshire, September, 1888.—W. H. Painter. Sent as voucher, but as Mr. Bennett says, “the true plant, but sent to ‘Ex. Club’ and recorded in 1887.”

**P. polygonifolius**, Pourr., submerged form. Long range, Killarney, August, 1888.—R. W. Scully. “It is impossible to come to any definite conclusion as to this plant with these specimens, as gathered, fruit or more perfect specimens must be waited for.”—Arthur Bennett. See ‘Journ. Bot.,’ June, 1889, p. 183.

**P. fluitans**, Roth. Cultivated plant. Root from Ramsey, Hunts, Co. 31, 17th July, 1888.—Alfred Fryer. (No. 1,124.) “In the ‘Ex. Club Report’ for 1884, I gave reasons why this plant should be considered and named as the *P. fluitans* of Roth. It seemed, so far as one could see, to be identical with that species. Since that time I have had some doubt as to whether our plant is so, or a hybrid. With much justice my friend Mr. Fryer asks, ‘may not Roth’s plant be a hybrid?’ (Against this must be urged that specimens of *fluitans* from the ‘Florence herb.,’ and ex herb. Alex. Braun, in my herbarium,
have ripe fruit.) I cannot call to mind any book in which the suggestion of hybridity is mentioned or expressed; but if this should be proved, it may well be that our plant is equally the plant of Roth, and having merely climatal or stational differences. I hesitate much to speak with any certainty on this, Mr. Fryer having had the opportunity of watching his specimens through all the stages of growth except fruiting. Mr. Fryer suggests that the major part of the specimens we get of continental *fluitans* are really only the upper part of the stem; and among a large series of *fluitans* from the area of the species, I have only two examples that have the submerged leaves to any extent, and two other examples named, at first, by Dr. Tiselius, *P. fluitans*, in 1881, but in 1885, referred by him to a probable cross "*P. natans* × *gramineus,*" with very narrow leaves, and in abundance. As yet I have failed to see a specimen named by Roth (if such are in existence), but nothing so close to Roth's plant, as usually so considered, has ever before been found in Britain. Fruit must be patiently waited for; that it will come may be fairly considered as a safe suggestion. In one case, in the United States, fruit was procured thirty years after the species had first been discovered; and in the case of Smith's *P. lanceolatus*, an interval of eighty years occurred before a ripe fruit was seen."—Arthur Bennett.

*Potamogeton fluitans*, 'Roth.' I send a supply of this species from the Wey and Arun Canal, West Sussex, August, 1888, and Surrey, 19th August, 1888. For details as to different states assumed by this plant at different seasons Mr. Alfred Fryer's paper ('*Journ. Bot.*,’, 1888, p. 273) should be consulted.—W. H. Beeby.


*P. varians*, Morong. Ditch on Broker's Farm, Witcham, Meadland's Drove, Mepal, Cambridge, 30th June, 1888, (No, 1,099).—Alfred Fryer. New record for County 29. "These, or similar, specimens have been passed by Rev. Morong as his plant. Undoubtedly the American specimens are very near this; they differ, however, in the floating leaves being more tapered into the petiole, and the direction of the submerged leaves is more like those of *Zizii*, while Mr. Fryer's specimens have the submerged leaves more like *heterophyllus.* The stipules also, in Mr. Morong's specimens, are decidedly of a stronger form, and, with the base, more truncate than the English specimens. Mr. Morong, on his tickets, gives ' *P. gramineus*, L., var. (?)* spathuliformis*, Robin's, in Gray's Man. ed. 5 ; *P. spatheiformis*, Tuckerman, in *Herb,* as synonyms; but I think Mr. Fryer doubts this somewhat."—Arthur Bennett.
Potamogeton corticeus, Fryer; P. lucens, corticeus, Nolte. Firtrey Hall Farm drain, Welches Dam, Cambridgeshire, 6th August, 1888 (No. 1,160).—Alfred Fryer. “Taking the plate in Reichenbach’s ‘Icones,’ and a type specimen in Nolte’s herbarium (Herb. Mus. Brit.), Mr. Fryer’s specimens show the following differences, i.e. the leaves of the barren shoots in Nolte’s pl. have shorter petioles and leaves than Mr. Fryer’s specimens. The submerged leaves of the Cambridgeshire plant are also more gradually tapered and less undulate; but there is no doubt Mr. Fryer is correct in naming them as the plant of Nolte, and his specimens are the best representation of the plant, other than Nolte’s own specimen’s, I have yet seen.”—Arthur Bennett.

P. Zizii, Roth, 1837. Long Drove, Pidley Fen, Hunts., 19th August, 1888.—Alfred Fryer. “P. angustifolius, Presl in Bertch et Presl, Rostlin, 1823, is probably Zizii (teste Fieber) but no specimens of Presl’s plant are in the herbarium of the German University at Prague, or of the Czech University.—Arthur Bennett.

P. zosteræolius, Schum., Isis, Oxford, August, 1887.—G. C. Druce.

Zostera marina, L., var. angustifolia, Fries. Budle Water, Northumberland, August, 1887.—H. E. Fox.

Z. nana, Roth. Fenham Flats, Northumberland, August, 1887.—H. E. Fox.


Scirpus fluviatilis, L. Farce Fen Drove, Hunts.; new County record; 4th September, 1888.—Alfred Fryer.

S. maritimus, L., v. compactus, Koch. Canvey Island, Essex, 1888. If this be the variety required by the club, I may remark that, although scarce in the locality mentioned, I have seen it elsewhere. It seems confined to the marsh ditches in the flats, and does not occur, to my knowledge, by the riverside.—Eyre de Cresigny. The varietal name of conglobatus, Gray, in ‘Nat. Arr.’ precedes that of Koch, 1844, or Reichb. Although figured in Krock’s ‘Fl. Silesia,’ it has no binomial name given it there.—Ed.


Kobresia caricina, Willd. Ben Laoigh, Mid-Perth, August, 1888. I did not see it on the Argyll side of the hill.—G. C. Druce.


C. axillaris, Good. Marcham, Berks, July, 1886.—G. C. Druce.

C. acuta, L. Oxford, August, 1887.—G. C. Druce.


C. acuta, L. Eynsham, Oxon, July, 1886.—G. C. Druce.

C. aquatilis, L., var. elatior, Bab. Clova, Forfar, August, 1882.—G. C. Druce.

C. Goodenowii, J. Gay, var. juncella (Fries.). Otmoor, Oxon, July, 1886.—G. C. Druce.

C. limosa, L. Loch Mallachie, Easterness, August, 1887.—G. C. Druce. New record for County 96.

C. rariflora, Sm. White Water, Forfar, August, 1882.—G. C. Druce.

C. binervis, Sm. Near the bog, on black, turfy soil, Keston Common, Kent, 1888. Monstrosity; the ♀ spikelets crowded up under the terminal ♂, and partly sterile.—Evré de Crespigny. "A very curious state, if binervis, reminding one of forms of C. semprevirens very much. I have never seen anything like the male spike glumes of Dr. Crespigny's plant in binervis. The growth of the plant is certainly very like binervis; Sm., but I should much like to have seen specimens gathered later. Is it a hybrid?"—Arthur Bennett.


C. Cederi, auct. non Ehrh. Ross Links, Northumberland, August, 1886.—H. E. Fox.

C. saxatilis, L. Ben Laoigh, Argyll, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce.

Setaria viridis, Beauv. Lakenheath, Suffolk, W., July, 1883.—G. C. Druce.


Alopecurus fulvus, Sm. Knypersley Reservoir, Staffordshire. Pointed out to me by Mr. J. W. White. A new County record, 18th July, 1888.—W. H. Painter.

A. geniculatus, L. Floating, glaucous form, with broad leaves, Wootton, Berks, September, 1888.—G. C. Druce. "Has no distinguishing name."—E. Hackel.


Phleum alpinum, L. Whitewater Side, Forfar, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce.

P. pratense, L., var. stoloniferum, Bab. Damp place, Whitnash,


_A. vulgaris_, With, var. _pumila_ (Linn.). Ben Lawers, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce.

_Polygono_ _monspeliensis_, Desf., St. Sampson's, Guernsey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.

_Deyeuxia neglecta_, Kunth. Loch Tay side, Mid-Perth, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce. I gathered this plant in a small marsh in Strath Tay (the precise locality of which I advisedly withhold, since the plant was confined to a very limited area), and thought it to be the above plant, so at once sent a specimen to Mr. Arthur Bennett, who wired back to my query "Yes, or borealis." I submitted it to Professor Hackel, who names it " _Calamagrostis neglecta_, Gaertn., var. _elatior_, Hartm. in 'Anders. Skand. Vaxt.', 2. p. 95, = _C. borealis_, Laestad." Nyman places _borealis_ as a subspecies of _neglecta_. If placed as a variety in our lists it will be _D. neglecta_, Kunth, var. _borealis_, (Laestadius). It is on record for Finmark, Finland, West Bothnia, Greenland.—Ed.

_D. neglecta_, Kunth, var. _Hookeri_ (Syme), sub _Calamagrostis_, A. B. Gravelly lake shore, Scawdy Island, Lough Neagh, Tyrone, June, 1870.—S. A. Stewart.

_Weingaertneria canescens_, Bernh. St. Ouen's, Jersey, June, 1887.—G. C. Druce.


_Poa alpina_, L. Ben Laoigh, Argyll, August, 1888.—G. C. Druce. New record for County 98.

_P. compressa_, L., var. _pauciflora_, if not _subcompressa_. Roadside, on gravelly soil, Beckenham, Kent, September, 1888. I submit, with some considerable hesitation, some specimens of this variety, which I would venture to call _pauciflora_. It is perhaps only a starved form of _subcompressa_, but the number of florets in each spikelet does not apparently exceed three.—Eyre De Crespiigny. "I think this has not
webbed florets, and is therefore not subcompressa."—C. C. Babington.  
"Is P. compressa (genuina), L."—E. Hackel. Not P. subcompressa, Parnell, as the florets are not webbed. Not P. polynoda, Parnell, as the knots are not above half the height of the plant. The florets vary from five to three. It is probably a starved form of type P. compressa, L. agg.—Ed.

Poa compressa, L., var. polynoda (Parnell). The presence of this grass in West Sussex is attested in 'Top. Bot.' by 'Borrer?' a record seemingly in need of the confirmation afforded by these specimens. The locality, rough pasture, south of Rudgwick, W. Sussex, is a piece of enclosed common, undrained and infertile, where the Poa, accompanied by few other grasses, grows thickly over four acres. If the var. polynoda is not to be entirely dropped, I think these plants should be so named, August, 1888.—J. WALTER WHITE.  
Pamell described polynoda as a species. Babington reduced it to a variety.—Ed.  
"Is compressa, L. genuina."—E. Rackel.  
F. ovina, L. var. paludosa, Gaud. Sunninghill, Berks., July, 1887. —G. C. DRUCE.  
F. sciuroides, Roth. Chazey Farm, Oxon, July, 1886.—G. C. DRUCE. "Yes,"—E. Hackel. A very luxuriant form.  
F. fallax, Th. A shade form, with very long and almost capillary leaves.—If a good variety, it may be that known as pseudo-rubra on the continent—not by any means freely flowering. Shady hedge bank, near Chislehurst, Kent, August, 1888.—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "Is F. rubra, genuina, ad var. fallax vergens; but there were some short runners at the root of one of the stems."—E. Hackel.  
F. rubra, L. var. fallax, Hack. Stow Wood, Oxon., June, 1887. —G. C. DRUCE. This appears to dispose of No. 1728 in London Catalogue, for, I suppose, it is Thuillier's plant, which Prof. Hackel thus describes, and reduces to a variety.  
Bromus erectus, Huds., var. pubescens, mihi. From two localities in Surrey; may not be infrequent. Foot of Reigate Hill, Surrey, July, 1888 [on note 1886 on label, which has also subvillosus on it].—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. Parnell described a var. hirsutus, which is, I suppose, the same as Babington's var. villosus.—Ed. "Is B. erectus, Huds., var. subvillosus, Regel."—E. Hackel.  
B. erectus, Huds. Riverside, Oxford, August, 1885.—G. C. DRUCE.  
B. madritensis, L. St. Vincent's Rocks, Gloster, W., August, 1879.—G. C. DRUCE.

B. racemosus, L. Pastures, Burnham, North Somerset, 10th June, 1888; and by Lawrence Weston, West Glo'ster, June, 1888. The comital details of the distribution in Britain of the Serafaluc s'section of the genus Bromus given in ‘Top. Bot.’ are very incomplete and unsatisfactory. Not only is B. commutatus treated as an aggregate, and made to include B. racemosus; but the latter name, when mentioned, is confessedly used doubtfully, as having been applied to at least three allied grasses. Moreover, in his mention of B. eu-racemosus, Mr. Watson seems to have considered it an importation brought in with foreign seeds, and said that his own knowledge of it was limited to its rare occurrence in Surrey, where he had observed it only in fields of sown grasses, and casually about railway stations. Our experience in the West of England is markedly different. In West Glo'ster and North Somerset B. eu-racemosus occurs in perhaps the majority of pastures, and is nowhere more abundant than in the rich grazing district that borders the Bristol Channel, where ancient marshes have been reclaimed and protected from inundation. This land has never felt the plough. On some portions of it the grass under notice is more plentiful than any other, and, in my opinion, is undoubtedly native.—J. Walter White. “Yes, rightly named.”—E. Hackel.

B. mollis, L. var. Chalky field, between Unwell Wood and Blewburton Camp, Berks., July, 1888.—G. C. Druce. The field in which it occurred was very barren, having had only a very scanty crop of barley the previous year, and was now lying fallow. This variety was the prevailing plant. In the country round, the var. glabrescens of mollis was a frequent corn field plant. After consulting various authors and herbaria I could find no similar variety, and was about to name it aggregata. (Persoon indeed had a var. conglobatus, but it did not agree with our plant.) I submitted some specimens to Prof. Hackel, who describes it as follows:—“B. mollis, L., var. interrupta, mihi (Hackel). Panicula brevi, interrupta, spiculis glomeratis, obovato ellipticis, gluma sterili superiore dimidiam spiculam æquante v. superante. Affinis B. mollis, L., var. conglomerato Persoon ‘Syn.’ i. 96, cujus panicula æqualiter compacta, spiculae angustiores, villosiores.” Prof. Hackel kindly offered to retain my suggested name, but I should have gladly given way to one whose researches in the Graminaceæ have been so thorough, and to whom this club is deeply indebted for his valued criticism, given ungrudgingly at a time when his monograph must have occupied so much of his time, even if his name had not been so much more descriptive than my own.—Ed.

B. commutatus, Schrad. Radcot, Oxon, July, 1886. This and racemosus, L., I hold to be truly native in Oxford and Berks.—G. C. Druce.

Brachypodium sylvaticum, Roem. et Schult., var. glabrescens, Syme. Purley Downs, Surrey, 1888.—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. Prof. Babington passes it as B. sylvaticum, without mentioning the varietal name. It has certainly less hairy glumes than the usual sylvestral and sepal form.—Ed.

Agropyron repens, Beauv., var. Leersianum, Gray. Forest Hill, Oxon, June, 1887. The Triticum barbatum of Duval Jouve.—G. C. DRUCE.


A. pungens, Roem. et Schult. Whitstable, Kent, September, 1888.—G. C. DRUCE, teste E. Hackel; also from EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. “Yes.”—Prof. Babington.

Hordeum maritimum, With. Ed. ii., 1787. Whitstable, Kent, September, 1888—G. C. DRUCE. This name is clearly preceded by that of H. marinum, Huds.—Ed.

Elymus arenarius, L. Sandhills at estuary of River Naver, below Betty Hill, Sutherland, 25th July, 1888.—J. COSMO MELVILL.


Cystopteris fragilis, Bernh., var. b. dentata, Hook? Loch Builg, Banff, 29th July, 1888.—H. D. GELDART.

C. montana, Bernh. Cliffs near Tyndrum, but in Argyll, August, 1888.—G. C. DRUCE. New record for County 98.


Gymnogramme leptophylla, Desv. S. Lawrence, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. DRUCE.

Equisetum maximum, Lam., var. serotinum, Braun. Monreith, Wigton, August, 1882.—G. C. DRUCE. A form with the aestival stem, bearing the fertile spike.—Ed.

E. arvense, L., var. alpestre, Wahl. Clova table land, Forfar, August, 1882. In ed. vii. of L.C., placed under E. pratense (which did not prevent its being recorded as occurring in Britain), and omitted in ed. viii., yet I venture to think worth inserting in the next edition of L.C.—G. C. DRUCE.

E. pratense, Ehrh. Den of Lawers, Mid-Perth, August, 1888.—G. C. DRUCE and F. J. HANBURY.

E. sylvaticum, L., var. capillare, Hoffm. Aldermaston, Berks, September, 1888.—G. C. DRUCE. I am afraid (notwithstanding the different appearance of our plant) that this is only a shade form of E. sylvaticum, L. I saw it last year in the vice-counties 22, 88, 89, 92, 95, and 98.
I. hystrix, Dur. L’Ancresse, Guernsey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.