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REPORT OF THE DISTRIBUTOR FOR 1892.

The number of plants sent in for the year is rather less than usual, still the list includes some interesting plants, especially from Ireland. The Rubi, as usual, are bulky both in specimens and literary matter.

I have given a heading for every wild plant sent in. It is greatly to be wished that at least ten specimens of each plant should be sent, and that the plants, as well as the labels, be attached to sheets of paper. The sorting out is always a troublesome and thankless task, which should not be increased by the loose labels and a deficient number of specimens in each cover sheet.

Our thanks are due to the members of the Club who have generously contributed specimens and critical notes, e.g., Rev. E. F. Linton, Rev. W. R. Linton, Rev. W. Moyle Rogers, Rev. E. S. Marshall, etc., and to referees on special groups, notably Prof. E. Hackel (whose notes, notwithstanding the many claims on his time, are so punctually to hand), Dr. Focke, M. Crépin, Mr. J. G. Baker, Mr. Arthur Bennett, Mr. F. J. Hanbury, Mr. J. Groves, Dr. Buchanan White, Dr. Lange, Herr Freyn, Mr. F. Townsend, and the Messrs. Groves.

In order to save space in our desiderata list I have ventured to supply a considerable number of members' special wants from my own collection.

G. CLARIDGE DRUCE.

118, HIGH STREET, OXFORD,
April, 1893.

LIST OF PLANTS CONTRIBUTED.

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Name & No. of Specimens \\
\hline
Bailey, Charles, F.L.S. & 139 \\
Bennett, Arthur, F.L.S. & 24 \\
Bromwich, H. & 100 \\
Druce, G. C., M.A., F.L.S. & 759 \\
Fryer, A. & 55 \\
Griffiths, J., F.L.S. & 205 \\
Geldart, H. D. & 79 \\
Hodgson, Miss. & 24 \\
Levinge, H. C. & 219 \\
Ley, Rev. A., M.A. & 172 \\
Linton, Rev. E. F., M.A. & 263 \\
Linton, Rev. W. R., M.A. & 578 \\
Marshall, Rev. E. S. & 101 \\
Melville, J., Cosmo, M.A. & 34 \\
Mott, F. T., F.S.A. & 23 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Name & No. of Specimens \\
\hline
Murray, Rev. R. P., M.A., F.L.S. & 110 \\
Painter, Rev. W. Hunt & 103 \\
Rogers, Rev. W. Moyle, M.A., F.L.S. & 48 \\
Scally, R. & 30 \\
Shoolbred, W. A., M.R.C.S. & 83 \\
Stewart, J. H. A. & 62 \\
Stewart, S. A. & 81 \\
Webster, G. & 25 \\
Wheldon, J. A. & 266 \\
White, J. W., F.L.S. & 235 \\
Wolley-Dod, Capt. A. H. & 316 \\
\hline
TOTAL & 3,752 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Ranunculus cambricus, A. Bennett. Coron Lake, Anglesey, June, 1892.—J. E. GRIFFITH. This plant was described in 'Science Gossip,' p. 198, 1892, by Mr. Bennett as \textit{R. aquatilis}, \textit{L.}, var. \textit{cambricus}, as follows:—"Growth and habit of \textit{R. fluitans}, but leaves
[with] much shorter segments, peduncles shorter, flowers very small, rarely fertile; allied to *Batrachium hirsutissimum*, Prahl,'Krit. Fl. Sch. Hols.,' 1890, p. 4, and *R. phellandrifolius*, 'Fl. Danica,' t. 2357." Mr. Arth. Bennett kindly tells me that Herr Freyn thinks it is *Batrachium carinatum*, Schur., but although he does not agree with this determination prefers to leave it under Freyn's name until he convinces him of its distinctness. My first acquaintance with the plant was made in July, 1875, when searching for *Elatine Hydropiper* in Llyn Coron, Anglesey. I sent specimens to Dr. Boswell, who thought it was *R. fluitans*, var. *Bachii*. Other critical botanists suggested var. *penicillatus* and var. *salsuginosus* as probable names. According to Herr Freyn *Batrachium carinatum*, Schur., belongs to *aquatilis* because of its papillose stigma, not as Schur. himself placed it near *R. Baudotii*.-G. C. Druce.


*R. tripartitus*, DC., c. *intermedius*, Knafl., near Penrhosligwy Church, Anglesey, May, 1892.—J. E. Griffith. In 'E. B. Suppl.,' 13, Mr. N. E. Brown says this is merely a condition of growth, i.e., having no submerged leaves, and is not a distinct variety of *R. tripartitus*, DC.—G. C. Druce.

*R. acris*, L., var. *vulgatus*, Jordan. Aonach Mor, and neighbouring corries, on the hills west of Glen Spean, Westernness, August, 1891. On these specimens (which Dr. Wettstein and Prof. A. von Kerner agree in naming as above) Herr Freyn reports:—"They have very slight covering of hairs, and such forms have not been noticed before. In habit they remind one of the northern forms of *R. acris*. The rhizome is also very weak as compared with that of typical *vulgatus*, no doubt in consequence of the more damp climate."—G. C. Druce.

*R. acris*, L. (sens. lat.), var. *pulillus*, Wahl. Corrie Sneachda, Easterness, August, 1891. This extreme form of *R. vulgatus*, Jord., I have only seen on the Cairngorm. The plants of Glen A'an and Braeriach belong to the forms of *R. vulgatus* alluded to above by Herr Freyn. I still think it is a good variety. Dr. Lange agrees with the name.—G. C. Druce.

*Corydalis bulbosa*, DC. Shrubbery at Totteridge, Herts, May, 1892.—A. H. Wolley-Dod. The record was published in the 'Phytologist,' 1855-56, p. 391, by the editors, W. Pamplin and A. Irvine, under the name of *C. solida*. The same wood (Puget's Wood, which according to the 'Flora of Herts' is a shrubbery) yielded *Crocus vernus* and the red primrose. In 'Supp. E. B., add. iii.,' Mr. N. E. Brown suggests that this should be called *Neckeria bulbosa*, N. E. Br., but Adanson's genus *Capnoides*, although faulty as an adjectival
name, antedates Scopoli's genus *Neckeria* (which only differs by a single letter from the Moss genus *Neckera*), and has already had named under it *Capnoides lutea*, Gärtn. = *Corydalis lutea*, DC. and *Capnoides solidus*, Mönch. This plant should be *Capnoides bulbosa*.

G. C. DRUCE.

*Fumaria confusa*, Jord. Railside, near Oxford, but in Berkshire, July, 1892. This is a new county record, but the plant is rather a casual there, although I have noticed it for the last four or five years.—G. C. DRUCE. "I should say correctly named."—Arth. Bennett. "Yes."—H. and J. Groves.

*F. officinalis*, L. Newbury, Berks. A large rampant glaucous form which, from descriptions, cannot be far away from *F. media*, Lois, of which, however, I have seen no authentic specimens.—G. C. DRUCE. "*F. officinalis*."—H. and J. Groves.

*F. parviflora*, Lamk. Lowbury, Berks, June, 1886.—G. C. DRUCE.

*Mathiola sinuata*, R. Br. Cobo Bay, Guernsey, June, 1877.—G. C. DRUCE.

*Nasturtium officinale*, R. Br., var. *microphyllum* (Bönnig.) Reichb. Wet roadside, near Wimborne, Dorset, June, 1892.—E. F. LINTON. "A larger plant than authentic examples, and the leaflets less obviously subpetiolate than in the true plant."—Arthur Bennett. It comes under the *N. officinale*, var. *praecox*, S. F. Gray, which is based on *N. aquaticum folii minoribus prcecoxius*. See ‘Ray. Syn.,’ Ed. iii., 301. It agrees fairly well with Dale's specimen, and with the figure No. 4360, vol. ii. of Reichenbach's 'Icones Fl. Helv. et Germ.' except that in the latter-the terminal lobe of the lower leaves is not very dissimilar in size, while in Mr. Linton's specimens they are distinctly larger. The generic name, *Nasturtium*, of Robert Brown is clearly antedated by Scopoli's *Roripa*. The name would therefore more correctly be *Roripa Nasturtium*, Beck. ‘Fl. Nied. Öst. ii.,' 463, var. *praecox* (Gray.)—G. C. Druce.

*Barbara intermedia*, Boreau. Cloverfield near Benham, and also near Newbury, Berks, June, 1892.—G. C. DRUCE. "Just the plant we get near here on the weald clay."—E. S. Marshall. "I do not think it belongs to *intermedia* but I am not able to name it, though I have gathered the same plant in Hayling Island and in Surrey, but always doubting where to place it."—Arth. Bennett. "I should call this *B. vulgaris*, R. Br."—W. R. Linton. "This is not a satisfactory plant. The leaves suggest *B. intermedia*, but the beak is not very short, and the flowers are large."—H. and J. Groves.

*Arabis petraea*, Lamk., var. *grandifolia*, Druce. Ben Laoigh, Argyll, August, 1889. This plant in cultivation keeps quite distinct from the Cairngorm plant, and is, I believe, a sub-species. The Cairngorm plant is very difficult to keep alive in our Oxford air, but this thrives and seeds freely. Slugs eat too readily the Cairngorm, but neglect this plant. It flowers earlier, but this may be from its bearing the climate better. I have written the name in the customary manner, but there appears to be great doubt if Lamarck's plant is the same as the British one. In the 'Enc. Methodique,' vol. i. p. 221, Lamarck describes his plant as being common in the Auvergne, where
our *Arabis petrcea* does not occur. It is true he refers to the plate in 'Hortus Elthamensis,' which is not particularly satisfactory, although it undoubtedly does duty for the Welsh form of *Arabis petrcea*, i.e., the hispid plant, but which is not identical on the one hand with the Ben Laoigh plant, nor on the other with Linnaeus' specimen of *Cardamine petrcea* in his herbarium. Later on I hope to examine and report on Lamarck's plant if specimens still exist in his herbarium. With reference to the remark that Sir Jos. Hooker in 'Island Life' says, "It is a form only distinguished by its larger flowers," quoted in the 'Report' for 1891 by the Editor, as it stands without the context, is I think a little misleading. It may be well to quote two or three remarks from 'Island Life,' which show in what manner the word "form" is there employed. It is stated that "*Rubus echinatus* is a variety of the widely spread *R. Radula*, itself a form of *R. fruticosus. Oenanthe fluviatilis* is the fluitant form of *O. Phellandrium.*" [The two plants are to me absolutely distinct.—G. C. D.] With regard to the new *Hieracium* Sir J. D. Hooker and Mr. J. Gilbert Baker say, "No case can be made of these. They are local forms with the shadowest of shady characters." In the same work *Arabis petrcea*, var. *grandifolia* is included among the 16 endemic varieties which Britain yields. From the leaf characters and the size of the flowers I think it may be described as distinct from *A. petrcea* as *A. grandifolia*. Should there already be a plant so named I would suggest the name of *Arabis scotica*. It may be known from *A. petrcea* by its broadly ovate nearly entire dark green leaves, thickly covered with bifid and trifid hairs, and by its flowers which are twice the size of ordinary *A. petrcea.*—G. C. Druce.

*Cardamine flexuosa*, With. forma. Heyford, Oxon, May, 1885. With larger flowers than usual.—G. C. Druce. "I don't think the *Cardamine* is more than *flexuosa*. The leaves of your specimen show no approach to *C. pratensis.*"—E. F. Linton. "A distinctive name for larger petalled forms seems scarcely justified."—W. R. Linton.

*Cochlearia anglica*, L. var. *Hortii*, Syme. Southport, April, 1892.—J. A. Wheldon. Mr. N. E. Brown considers this to be the type of *C. anglica*, L. Messrs. Groves say Syme and Watson gave two varietals names when a species was represented by two equally common forms.—G. C. Druce.


*Sisymbrium* ——. Waste ground near the railway, Milverton, Warwickshire, August, 1892.—H. Bromwich. Two very defective specimens which were named *Erysimum repandum*, L. by a referee, but the stem clothed with patent hairs, the upper leaves cut into long
strap-shaped segments, and its larger flowers rather suggest S. orientale, L. This can be distinguished from S. Sinapistrum, Crantz, as Boissier in the ‘Fl. Orient.’ vol. i., p. 216 points out, by the calyx being closed ("calyce clauso") in S. Columnae, Jacq. = S. Orientale, I., while S. pannonicum, Jacq. = S. Sinapistrum, Crantz, has the "calyce patentissimo."—G. C. Druce.

Sisymbrium repandum, L. Ballast, Birkenhead, Cheshire, 7th July, 1892.—J. A. WHELDON. This was thought by a critical botanist to be S. Columnae, but the hairs on the leaves and stems of this plant are adpressed, and the leaves are only faintly toothed, not runcinately cut as in that plant. Its proper name is Erysimum repandum, Linn., being described by Linnæus in the ‘Amoen. Acad.’ iii., 415, and figured in ‘Reichb. Fl. Helv. et Germ.’ 4384, but from rather an unhealthy specimen. It is a casual of increasingly frequent occurrence. It occurred rather plentifully near Didcot, Berks, this last season.—G. C. Druce.

Erysimum perfoliatum, Crantz. Weed in an oat field, Walton, Lancashire, July, 1892.—J. A. WHELDON. Bentham and Hooker, in the ‘Genera Plantarum’ keep the genus Conringia distinct from Erysimum, as does Durand in his ‘Index.’ This plant belongs to Conringia, and its oldest name that I know under that genus is C. perfoliata, Link, ‘En. Hort. Berol.’ ii. 172, 1822. Those botanists who are in favour of retaining the original specific name will probably prefer C. orientalis, Andr. in DC. Syst. ii. 508, and Dumort. ‘Fl. Belge.’ 123 (1827) since it was the Brassica orientalis of the ‘Species Plantarum.’—G. C. Druce.

Camelina sativa, Crantz. Rail side, Didcot, Berks, August, 1892. G. C. DRUCE. “Seems to be this rather than C. fatida.”—Arthur Bennett.

Thlaspi perfoliatum, L. Stony ground near Charlbury, Oxon, April, 1885.—G. C. DRUCE.

Bunias orientalis, L. Woolwich Arsenal, Kent, June, 1892.—A. H. WOLLEY-DOD.

Helianthemum Breweri, Planch. Holyhead, Anglesey, June, 1890. I think the plant which I gathered with the above, and referred by Mr. J. G. Baker to true H. guttatus, is ebracteate H. Breweri, in which the shape and texture of the leaf differ somewhat from the Jersey plant. In that case, if H. Breweri be kept distinct, it may be distinguished as var. ebracteata. Willkomm and Lange place our H. guttatus in the genus Tuberaria as Tuberaria variabilis, Willk. var. vulgaris, sub-var. Milleri.—G. C. DRUCE.

Viola odorata, L. var. imberbis, Leighton. Wood above Mickleham, Surrey, 1st May, 1892.—A. H. WOLLEY-DOD. This was first described as Viola imberbis by Leighton, in ‘Loudon’s Mag. Nat. Hist.’ vol. viii., 277, but in the ‘Flora of Salop,’ p. 116, Mr. Leighton, following Henslow (in 2nd Ed. of ‘Lond. Cat.’) reduced it to a variety of V. odorata. It is a white flowered form in which the lateral petals are destitute of the hairy line, a character not influenced, Mr. Leighton found, by cultivation. I have the same plant from Oxon and Berks. The purple flowered form has also been found.—G. C. Druce.
**Viola odorata**, L. var *sepincola* (Jord.) South Harting, Sussex.—23rd March and 6th October, 1892.—M. L. HODGSON.


*V. Curtisii*, var. Sandhills, Southport.—J. A. WHELDON. "Is *V. sabulosa.*"—J. G. Baker. This seems to me the original *V. Curtisi*, i.e., *Curti* a *Forsterii* L.C., ed. vii., the parti-coloured plant being called there var. *Mackaii.* It agrees very well with cultivated specimens of the Braunton Burrows plant from Mr. Watson's garden, and wild specimens from the same locality."—Arth. Bennett.

*Polygala serpyllacea*, Weihe. Large leaved form. Glen A'an, Banff, August, 1891.—G. C. DRUCE.

*P. calcarea*, F. Schultz. Streatley, Berks, May, 1892. Mr. N. E. Brown in 'E. B. Suppl.,' p. 35, says the name *P. amarella*, Crantz, should be substituted for this, "as it is doubtless the same plant." As I have pointed out in the 'Annals of Scottish Nat. Hist.' we want further evidence than this statement—positive though it is—before we substitute Crantz's name *P. amarella*, which was given, as I contend, to a different plant. In the first place *P. calcarea* is not included by Beck or Nyman as an Austrian plant (but Günther Beck includes it in his Flora of Südosenien). Beck says *P. amarella*, Crantz, is *P. amara*, L., 'Sp. Pl.,' ed. ii., 987, and according to Koch and Neileich, but not corresponding to the cited habitat. In the Linnaean herbarium *P. amara*, L., 'Syst.,' ed. x., 1759, is represented by *P. calcarea*, but Linnaeus in the 'Sp. Pl.,' ed. ii., cites Jacquin 'En. Vind.,' and the plant of Jacquin figured afterwards in the 'Fl. Aust.,' 1778, from the classic locality of *P. amara* is certainly not *P. calcarea*. Finally Nyman in 'Supp. to Conspr. Fl. Eur.,' p. 358, places *P. amarella* under *P. austriaca*, Crantz = *P. uigenosa*, Reichb. So far as I can see *P. calcarea*, F. Schultz, is still the name to be given to our chalk *Polygala*, and if so the synonymy in 'E.B. Suppl.' will have to be considerably altered.—G. C. DRUCE.

*Dianthus cegis*, Sm. Cheddar Rock, Somerset, N., June, 1884. In the recent monograph on the *Dianthus*, Mr. Williams retains this name notwithstanding that he has pointed out *D. gratianopolitanus*, Vill. (mispelled *grantianopolitanus* in 'E.B. Suppl.') has the priority.—G. C. DRUCE.

*Silene Cucubalus*, Wibel, var. *S. oleracea*, Bor, 'Fl. du Centre de la France,' p. 95. It seems a characteristic form, but is connected with type by every intermediate. Woolwich Arsenal, Kent, 16th June, 1892.—A. H. WOLLEY-DOD. "Is var. *angustifolius,"" Ten.—W. R. LINTON. "I suppose differs by the narrower leaves and clustered flowers at the apex of the stem. Is it the *S. inflata* var. *oleracea*, Ficinus, 'Fl. d. Geg. um Dresden,' ed. ii. p. 313 (1821), mentioned by Mr. Brown in 'E. B. Suppl.,' p. 38? I have not seen specimens of either that or Boreau's plant."—Arth. Bennett. Boreau describes his *S. oleracea* as having oblong or lanceolate leaves, and a dichotomous panicle of flowers with oval calyx; in his *S. vesicaria* the leaves are oval lanceolate, the flowers in a terminal panicle of 2 to 10 flowers, with
roundish oval calyx. *S. brachiata*, Jord., is an intermediate form.—
G. C. Druce.

*Silene maritima*, With. On the sands to the north-east of South:
port, S.W. Lancashire, 27th August, 1892. Not recorded for vice-county
59 in ‘Top. Bot.,’ ed. ii., p. 64. It occupies a limited area on the
coast, but until this year I had not noticed that it had not been
recorded for South-West Lancashire.—CHARLES BAILEY.

*S. dichotoma*, L. Casual on ballast, Aintree, Lancashire. Previously
unrecorded. August, 1892.—J. A. WHELDON. “I think correct.”
Arth. Bennett. The authority for the above name is not Linnaeus.
Ehrhart in the ‘Beitrags.’ vii. 144, first described it. It is a not un-
frequent casual.—G. C. Druce.

*Lychnis dioica*, L. x *L. alba*, Mill. Near Bradfield College,
Berk, July, 1892—G. C. DRUCE.

*L. alpina*, L. Little Cairnnoch, Forfar, Aug., 1882.—G. C.
DRUCE.

*Cerastium quaternellum*, Fenzl. Stoke Poges Common, Bucks,
May, 1889. *C. erectum*, Coss. et Germ. ‘Fl. Par.’ Ed. i.; p. 37, is a
name in which the specific word is retained.—G. C. DRUCE.

*C. tetrandrum*, Curtis. Culbin Sands, near Forres, Elgin, July,
1889.—G. C. DRUCE.

*C. viscosum*, L. var, *holosteoides* (Fries). River Cree side, near
Newton Stewart, Wigtion, Aug., 1883. I still think this is correctly
named. The Tay side plant is not always constant in having the
pubescence on the stem absolutely restricted to the lines. In the
‘Fl. France’ Gren. et Godr., vol. i., p. 271 (1848), reduced this
to var. *microptalum.—G. C. DRUCE.*

*C. alpinum*, L. var. *pubescens*, Syme. Aonach Mor, Westerness,
Aug., 1891.—G. C. DRUCE.

*C. arcticum*, Lange. Aonach Mor, Westerness, July, 1891.
Glen A’an, Banff, 1891. Some of the specimens Dr. J. Lange would
refer to *C. alpinum*. Mr. N. E. Brown considers this is not
specifically distinct from *C. latifolium*, Linn., and would call it
*C. latifolium*, Linn. var. *Smithii*, Syme.—G. C. DRUCE.

*C. Edmonstonii*, Beeby. Buness, Unst, Shetland, Aug., 1892.—
W. A. SCHOOLBRED. In ‘E. B. Suppl.,’ Mr. N. E. Brown again
places this under *C. latifolium* var. *Edmonstonii*, H. C. Wats.
Mr. Watson said this came up as true from seed as *C. alpinum.—
G. C. Druce.

*C. trigynum*, Vill. Aonach Mor, and on Beinn Chaoruinn,
Westerness, and Glen A’an, Banff, Aug., 1891.—G. C. DRUCE.

*Stellaria umbrosa*, Opitz. Shady hedgebank, near Swallowfield
and Arborfield, Berks, July, 1892. New County Record.—G. C.
DRUCE.

*Arenaria serpyllifolia*, L. var. Dry sand pit above Old Carth
Mill, detached portion of Flint, geographically Salop. 30th July,
1892.—A. H. WOLLEY-DOD, who queries “Is this anything but a
 glandular state of the type? The glandular hairs seem to be
additional to the subspinous hairs, being longer and more slender,
those on the pedicels being spreading instead of reflexed as the non-


A. serpyllifolia, L. var. macrocarpa, Lloyd = A. Lloydii, Jord. Summit of cliff towards Needles, Isle of Wight, 20th July, 1892.—A. H. Wolley-Dod, who says "these plants, and those in preceding packet, were growing together on the broken ground at the top of the cliff. They appear to differ from them only in the absence of glands, the latter being only developed on the plants which grew on the barren spots, which would rather indicate that one is a state of the other. Mr. Beeby thinks that they should be named as above. As the variety is said to be eglandulous, I have named the glandular one var. glutinosa, Koch." "Good Lloydii. I have found this and glutinosa growing together in Kent."—E. S. Marshall. "Diffs from authentic Cherbourg examples by the longer internodes, the nerves of the sepals less prominent, and the hairs of the leaves more numerous, and without the transparent ones along the leaf base, and in being much less tufted. Mr. Lloyd's plant has much the growth of the compact forms of A. ciliata, the very numerous lower leaves densely crowded, and the numerous branches at the apex of the root."—Arthur Bennett. "Capt Wolley-Dod's Arenaria are interesting. His var. Lloydii really seems that plant (judging from the description), but I should call his glutinosa nearer to leptoclados, and I do not see what there is to keep his 'serpyllifolia, var.' from typical serpyllifolia."—W. Moyle Rogers. A. Lloydii, Jord. 'Pugill pl. Nov.' (1852), p. 37, = A. serpyllifolia, L., var. macrocarpa, 'Lloyd, Fl. Loir. Inf.,' p. 42, is figured in Willkomm's 'Icones,' p. 37, and described on p. 95. "Species proxima quidem A. serpyllifoliae sed ab ea cyma abbreviata, sepalis inaequalibus exterioribus ovatis multo latoribus quinquenerviis neque lanceolatis acutissimis trinervii, pilis nervorum incurvato-adscendentibus neque erecto-patulis, antheris purpureis et seminibus majoribus obtuse neque acute tuberculatis bene distincta est." On the plant from the Isle of Wight, near the Needles, the sepals were not seven-nerved in the three specimens I examined, but only five-nerved, nor were the sepals so obovate as in the figure cited, resembling as they did the figure given there of serpyllifolia.—G. C. Druce. "This is A. serpyllifolia, var. scabra, Fenzl."—Dr. Lange.
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must be referred to S. Reuteri, Boiss, from Spain."—J. Lange. This is figured in Willkomm’s ‘Icones et descriptiones Plantarum Nov. crit. et rar.’ Europæ Austro-occidentalis præcipue Hispanæ, tab. 73. And is described on p. 114 l.c. as ‘Annu, pygmaea, multicusulis radice tenui perpendiculari. Caules 1-2 pollicares, erecto-patuli, fere a basi dichotome ramosi, internodiis brevibus. Folia superius et media internodiis breviore vix lineam longa, infima 2-3.” longa internodiis longiora, omnia linearis lanceolata acuminata aristata, basi ciliata. Flores tetrameri minimi solitarii subcymosi breviter pedunculati, pedunculis et floriferis et fructiferis erectis calyce longioribus setaceis. Sepala \( \frac{1}{3} \) longa ovato oblonga glabra mutica apice subincerta uninervia margine anguste membranacea, in flore fructifero capsule adpresso eaque breviore. Petala nulla. Stamina 4 sepali breviora, antheris didymis. Capsula quadrivalvis, valvis apice emarginato-truncatis. Semina ignota. Tota plantula late virida et parce glandulosa-puberula. = S. Reuteri Boissier in ‘Diagn. Pl. Orient.’ ser. ii n.l. p. 82. Species e sectione Saginella Fenzl, proxima S. apetala L. et S. patula Jord. Prior differt foliis longioribus pedunculis elongatis, et sepali etiam in statu fructifero in crucem expansis. Cf. Reich. Ic. f. 4,958 (icon bona) S. patula, Jord. Obs. i. p. 23. t. 3. f. a (icon optima) praeter habitum procerum laxum capsula non excedente distincta est. Hab. in Hispania centrali circa Madritum, Reuter!" See also Willkomm and Lange’s ‘Prod. Florae Hispanicæ,’ vol. iii, 602. Nyman ‘Cons. Fl. Europæ.’ At first I was inclined to pass this over as S. ciliata, Fries, but I could see no mucro on the two sepals, and it then recalled a form which I had previously gathered in Northants which had all the sepals blunt and adpressed to the calyx. Dr. Lange kindly identified it as above. The plant may be known from S. apetala by its sepals not spreading when the capsule is ripe in the form of a cross, from S. procumbens by its erect peduncles, and from S. ciliata by all the sepals being blunt and shorter than the capsule. The distribution of S. Reuteri, Boiss., in Europe was up to this record supposed to be confined to the district round Madrid, a variety—peduncularis being found in “Aragonia australi,” Fl. Hisp. l.c.—G. C. Druce.

Corion medium, N.E.Br. In a marshy meadow at Marcham, Berks, August, 1891.—G. C. DRUCE. This interesting addition to the Berkshire Flora was made in the previous year. It occurred in that singular tract of the country which is watered by a saline spring near to the locality for Scirpus maritimus, and where Apium graveolens, Carex distans, Oenanthe Lachenalii, and Zannichellia pedunculata have also been found. The plant grows among grass where it may easily escape notice, but particularly delights in the bare spots caused by the trampling of cattle, and is too wide spread and plentiful to be a recent introduction. Can it be a survival? In the ‘Supplement to E.B.,’ Mr. N. E. Brown has placed it under the above name, but the genus Corion was founded by Mitchell in 1744, i.e., before the starting point of botanical nomenclature, 1753, fixed by the Berlin Committee, and is therefore not valid. It is true in the preface to the ‘Supplement’ Mr. N. E. Brown fixes his citation of genera from 1735, but he is not consistent, since Nasturtium and other
genera are retained by him. The name of the plant should be
Buda media, Dumort., ‘Fl. Belg.,’ p. 110, 1827, since it was the
Arenaria media of the ‘Sp. Pl.’ Ed. 1.—G. C. Druce.

Malva borealis, Wallm. Crossness, near Erith, Kent, 11th September,
1892.—A. H. Wolley-Dod. “Is this not rather M. parviflora?”

M. verticillata, Linn.? Near the railway, Milverton, Warwickshire,

M. niceensis, All. Waste ground, York, August, 1888.—J. A.

Linum ——— In some quantity where rubbish has been shot
at Aintree, Lancashire, June to August, 1892. Differs from L. usitatis-
simum, L., in having carpels ciliate within and more stems, is it
L. crepitans?—J. A. Wheeldon. The variety crepitans is described in
Böninghausen’s ‘Prod. Fl. Monast,’ p. 94. It has the capsule much
longer than the calyx and dehisces elastically. Nothing is said about
the ciliation of the carpels, etc. This is not the var. crepitans.—G. C.
Druce.

—This is the type as it is the plant of the Linnean Herb. Smith in
‘E. B.’ describes the samaras as downy. It is by far the commoner
form in central England.—G. C. Druce.

A. campestre, L., var. leiocarpon, Wallr. Near Radley, Berks,
August, 1891.—The glabrous fruited form.—G. C. Druce.

Genista anglica, L. Braemar, Aberdeen S., July, 1884.—G. C.
Druce.

Trigonella polycerata, L. Waste ground: several fine plants,
Foss Island, York, August, 1889.—J. A. Wheeldon. Yes.—G. C.
Druce.

Medicago denticulata, Willd. Nene side, Northampton, August,
1878, casual.—G. C. Druce.

M. apiculata, Willd. Waste ground, Foss Island, York, 1889.—
J. A. Wheeldon. Yes; the spines almost obsolete.—G. C. Druce.

M. maculata, Sibth. Nene side, Northampton, casual, August,
1878. The older name appears to be M. arabica, Huds. ‘Fl. Angl.,’
1762, also All. ‘Pl. Ped.,’ i785.—G. C. Druce.

Melilotus cceruleus, L. On waste ground, Foss Islands, York,
August, 1889.—J. A. Wheeldon. No, this is Trigonella Besseriana
Ser. in ‘DC. Prod.,’ ii. 181, which is kept distinct from Trigonella
841. The latter puts it in the genus Melilotus as M. procumbens,
Bess. ‘En. Pl. Volhyn.’ 30 (1822). It is the Trigonella procumbens
of Reichb. ‘Icon.” iv. 35. f. 525 (1826) and the Melilotus laxiflorus
Helv. et Germ.’ vol. xxii. p. 48, it is placed as variety laxiflora of T.
caruca, Ser., from which it differs by its laxer head of flowers, by its
much narrower leaves, which are more sharply denticulate, by the
narrower stipules, and by the beak of the fruit being straighter.
Of course, this is only a ballast casual.—G. C. Druce.

M. parviflora, Lamk. Abundant on waste ground, Foss Island,
York, August, 1889.—J. A. WHELDON. The older name is *M. indica*, Allione 'Fl. Ped.' It was the *Trifolium Melilotus indica* of the 'Sp. Pl.'—G. C. Druce.

*Trifolium Molinerii*, Balb. Portelet, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.

*T. strictum*, L. La Moye, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.

*Spiraea Ulmaria*, L., var. *denudata*, Presl. Between Alverstone and Newchurch, Isle of Wight; Edge Green, near Malpas, Cheshire, 30th July, 1892. Appears to be not uncommon. I could generally succeed in finding it mixed with the type whenever I searched for it. It appears to be quite independent of sunshine or shade. Besides the localities on the labels I have seen it by the canal at Hertford.—A. H. WOLLEY-DOD. Bönninghausen in "Prod. Fl. Monast" reduced Presl's species to a var. of *S. Ulmaria.*—G. C. Druce.

*Rubus Idaeus*, b. *Leessi*, Bab. Perfeddoed road, Bangor (Carnarvon), Aug., 1891.—J. E. GRIFFITH. First described, according to Dr. Focke, by Willdenow as *R. obustifolius*, and in 1839 by Arrhenius under the name of *R. idaeus, anomalus* from Sweden. According to the continental interpretation of the Leges nomen. it would probably be written as *R. idaeus*, Linn. var. *obstisfolius* (Willd.)—G. C. Druce.

*R. nitidus*, W. & N.? var. *integribasis*, P. J. Muell. See 'Journ. Bot.,' 1890, p. 100. This form which Dr. Focke believes to be P. J. Mueller's var. *integribasis*, replaces the type in S. Hants generally, and is the only form of *R. nitidus* known in Devon and Dorset. Kinson, Dorset; panicle, July; leaves, October, 1892.—E. F. LINTON. "Undoubtedly the plant which Dr. Focke has taught us to call *integribasis*; but it may be desirable to point out that it is no longer the 'only,' though still the usual form of *R. nitidus* found in Dorset."—W. M. Rogers. Also from Corfe Castle, Dorset, July, 1892, and Parkstone, Dorset (Coll. F. A. Rogers).—W. MOYLE ROGERS.


*R. opacus*, Focke. Vales Wood, Ruyton XI Towns, Salop, 17th and 24th September, 1892. A very fine growth of this bramble occurred in the lower part of this wood, which is situated on red sandstone; so fine that I did not recognise it, and owe the name to the Rev. W. Moyle Rogers, and the confirmation of it to Dr. W. O. Focke. The petals were pink, rather a light shade. Stamens on belated flowers appeared very short, but this may have been due to the late period of gathering. Barren stems were erect below and arched over above, some of them 6ft. high.—E. F. LINTON.

*R. affinis*, W. & N. West Cliff, Bournemouth, S. Hants, July, 1892.—W. MOYLE ROGERS.


R. rhamnifolius, dumosus, Focke. Near Bodorgan, Anglesey, July, 1889.—J. E. Griffith. "The materials are not such as to show with certainty whether this should go to rhamnifolius or to our old aggregate "umbrosus" (the latter being distinct, as now appears, from R. nemoralis, P. J. Muell, at least as understood by Genevier); but the stem leaves seem to belong to our ordinary English rhamnifolius."—W. M. Rogers. Rev. W. R. Linton thought his specimen was R. corylifolius, Sm., as is the panicle of mine.—G. C. Druce.

R. Maassii, Focke. Perfeddcoed Road, Bangor, August, 1892.—J. E. Griffith. "Not R. Maassii, Focke (which has greener sepals and stem quite glabrous), but apparently R. dumosus, Levf."—W. M. Rogers.


R. incurvatus, Bab. Near Corfe Castle, Dorset, August, 1892.—W. Moyle Rogers.

R. imbricatus, Hort. Near Corfe Castle, Dorset, 25th July, 1892; River Wye, August, 1891.—W. Moyle Rogers. Near Tros Cunob, Bangor, August, 1892.—J. E. Griffith. "There is some look of imbricatus here, but more of R. affinis, W. & N. In this case, however, mature stem leaves and stems are necessary for determination, and I have seen neither in Mr. Griffith's gathering."—W. M. Rogers.

R. erythrinus, Genev. Vales Wood, Ruyton XI Towns, Salop, 24th September, 1892.—E. F. Linton. Heanton Punchardon, North Devon, July, 1892.—W. H. Painter. Mynydd-bach, Shirenewton, Monmouth, 25th August, 1892.—W. A. Shoolbred. "The Monmouth plant is R. Lindleianus, Lees. The other two are, I believe, rightly named erythrinus, though the Salop plant looks untypical, as being (I suppose) shadegrown, and in the North Devon one the hairs on panicle rachis are rather more numerous and more spreading than usual."—W. M. Rogers. "The Salop locality gives a new County record, and a northern extension of this bramble."—E. F. Linton.


R. argentatus, P. J. Muell. Near Llanwnda station, Carnarvonshire, August, 1889.—J. E. Griffith. "I can give no opinion on this without seeing better specimens."—W. M. Rogers.


Rubus podophyllus, P. J. Müll. Near Felyn Fawr, Bethesda, August, 1892.—J. E. Griffith. "Not R. podophyllus, as I understand it; or very near it. It rather strongly recalls plants which Dr. Focke has put under R. saxicolus, P. J. Müll, though they have longer hair on the panicle-rachis and mostly quinate leaves; but I know no other name to suggest."—W. M. Rogers.


R. macrothyrsos, Lange. Hedge near Chard, Somerset, 19th August, 1892.—R. P. Murray. "This seems identical with the plants from N. Wales (vide 'Bot. Ex. Club Rept.,' 1889, 248, 249) and from Dorset, which Dr. Focke first named R. macrothyrsos, J. Lange—a name which he now considers must give place to R. gymnastachys, Genev. It is a stronger and far more glandular plant than another which he has similarly named for me from Herefordshire, and which agrees perhaps better on the whole with Genevier's description, though not with the majority of his specimens in the Cambridge Herb., as these appeared to me to be mostly intermediate between these extreme forms. Since writing as above, I learn from Mr. Murray that Dr. Focke has confirmed the name gymnastachys (= macrothyrsos) for this Chard plant."—W. M. Rogers.

R. pyramidalis, Kalt., variety? Woods, Dinmore, Hereford, 22nd September, 1892.—I suspect this to be substantially the same plant as that contributed to the Club last year by Rev. W. H. Purchas, from the same locality, under the same names, and assigned in the Report (p. 328) to R. gymnastachys, Gen., by Dr. Focke and Rev. W. M. Rogers. The plant now sent is widely distributed in Herefordshire, and has been assigned to several names. Hence, I venture to send it again this year.—Augustin Ley. "I feel considerable difficulty here. If I had the stem only to judge by, I should say R. leucostachys, because of the close mat of hairs. The strong prickles on the panicle seem to point the same way. But, in most other respects, the characters (and especially the narrow petals) seem rather those of one of the nearly eglandular forms of R. pyramidalis, Kalt."—W. M. Rogers.


R. pyramidalis, Kalt. Near Llanberis, August, 1892.—J. E. Griffith. "I suggested this name to Mr. Griffith for this handsome plant a short time ago, and I know no better now; but it is exceptionally glandular for pyramidalis, and there are other features (the somewhat mixed armature of the subglabrous stem, &c.) which make it, at all events, untypical."—W. M. Rogers.

R. macrophyllus, W. & N. Middle Marwood, N. Devon, 29th July,
1892.—W. H. Painter. Woburn Sands, September, 1892, Bucks.—
E. F. Linton. New County Record.

_Rubus Schlechtendalii_, Weihe. Boar's Hill, Berks, Sep., 1892.—G.
C. Druce.

_R. villicaulis_, Kœhl. Field between Cromer and Runton, East
Norfolk, 20th July, 1891. Not recorded for Vice-county 27 in

_R. adsitus_, Geniev. = _R. micans_, Godr. Penselwood, Somerset,
August, 1891.—R. P. Murray. Mounton, Monmouth, October,
1891, and 8th September, 1892.—W. A. Shoolbred.

_R. gratus_, Focke. Gowerton to Penclawydd, Glamorgan, 18th
Aug., 1892.—E. F. Linton.

_R. leucandrus_, Focke. Bailie Gate, Dorset, July, 1890, and

Mr. Rogers confirms, remarking that it differs from the type in the
more than usually aciculate panicle and rounded terminal leaflet.—
W. R. Linton.

_R. Devoniensis_, Focke. Near Bangor, August, 1892.—J. E.
Griffith. "I hear from Mr. Griffith that this plant was named
_R. Devoniensis_ by Dr. Focke. It seems to me, however, to be at
least as near _R. amplificatus_, Lees, as to Mr. Briggs' Devon specimens
of _Devoniensis_, of which I have a good series and have seen more at
Cambridge."—W. M. Rogers.

_R. Boreanus_, G. Genev. 'Monographie des Rubus,' &c., ed. i.,
p. 154; ed. ii., p. 170. Frequent in the neighbourhood of Cromer;
as the Beacon, 18th July, 1891; hedge banks, Sheringham, 22nd
July, 1891; and hedge banks, Roughton Mill, 22nd July, 1891.
Identified for me, as are all the other E. Norfolk _Rubi_ which I send
this year to the Club, by the Rev. E. F. Linton, who has long known
this bramble in Norfolk, but could not find a name for it until this
year. Genevier in his ' Monographie,' pp. 170, 171, characterises this
species by its very bristly and slightly glandular branches; by its non-
aciculate sepals, which are spreading after flowering; by its small-sized
rose or violet-coloured petals; and by its violet-coloured stamens (at
least at their base) exceeding the styles of the same colour.—Charles
Bailey. "Clearly _R. Boreanus_, as well so well represented in the
Cambridge Herb., and as found by Mr. Briggs near Plymouth. I have
also seen specimens of the Rev. E. F. Linton's from several E. Norfolk
localities collected in 1888."—W. M. Rogers.

_R. Borreri_, Bell-Salt. On the common near Mangotsfield
Station, W. Gloster, 1891. Between Keynsham and Brislington,
N. Somerset, September, 1892. Dulverton, 27th July, 1892, Som. S.
—J. W. White. Also from Dulverton, Som. S., 1892.—R. P.
Murray, who writes: "I have sent a considerable supply of this.
It has no connection with the plant of the London Catalogue, except
the name, which had been misapplied until the Rev. W. M. Rogers
discovered the true plant in the Borrer Herbarium at Kew. I have it
from both the vice-counties of Somerset (5 and 6). It was formerly
placed by Mr. Briggs as a var. of _R. villicaulis_, while Prof. Babington
agreed with me in placing it near \textit{R. infestus}.” Rev. W. Moyle Rogers says these are all typical.

\textit{Rubus anglosaxonicus}, O. Gelert. ‘Saertryk af Botanisk Tidsskrift,’ 16 bind, p. 81. Edge of a field, in a narrow lane at the back of the New Bath Hotel, Matlock, Derbyshire, 5th October, 1891. I first collected this plant at the same station, 28th July, 1884, and distributed it (not through the Exchange Club) as \textit{R. macrophyllus}, W. & N.; one of these 1884 specimens was named by Dr. Focke \textit{R. anglosaxonicus} (see ‘The Flora of Derbyshire,’ by Rev. W. H. Painter, p. 46).—Charles Bailey. “This is hardly typical \textit{anglosaxonicus}, though near it. I have seen from the same locality both \textit{anglosaxonicus} and \textit{rudis}, and also plants which (like this of Mr. Bailey’s) seem intermediate between the two, and are probably of hybrid origin.”—W. M. Rogers.

\textit{R. anglosaxonicus}, Gelert. Wood, Belmont, Herefordshire, 19th August, 1892.—Augustin Ley. Roadside, near Bailey Gate, Dorset (connecting type and var. \textit{raduloides}), 26th August, 1892.—R. P. Murray. “The Bailey Gate plant is especially interesting to me as a link between typical \textit{anglosaxonicus} and my var. \textit{raduloides}, though I consider it nearer to the latter, especially in the stem leaves. The Belmont plant must, I think, go elsewhere. It seems essentially the same as the Rev. E. F. Linton’s Vales Wood specimens (see below) for which I have suggested the name \textit{R. Newbouldii}, Bab., though I should add that I have seen no authentic specimens of that species.”—W. M. Rogers.

\textit{R. anglosaxonicus}, Gelert, var. \textit{raduloides}, Rogers. Woods near Hanham, W. Gloucester, 29th August, and 3rd Sept., 1892. Leigh Woods, N. Somerset, 29th Aug., 1892.—J. W. White. “The Hanham plant is one of several that I had before me when I wrote the description of \textit{raduloides} (‘Journ. Bot.’, 1892, p. 269), and exactly represents that var. The specimens from Leigh Woods also belong, I consider, to the same var., though they are less strongly marked.”—W. M. Rogers.

\textit{R. anglosaxonicus}, Gelert. Chase Wood, Ross, Herefordshire, and \textit{R. anglosaxonicus}, var. \textit{c. setulosus}, Rogers, ‘Journ. Bot.,’ xxx., p. 269, in quarry at the foot of the same wood, July, 1892. The bush from which these specimens were taken was examined by the Rev. W. Moyle Rogers and myself, and by him pronounced to be what Dr. Focke had assured him to be exactly the Continental \textit{anglosaxonicus}. I need scarcely say that it is quite different from the Matlock plant, which was formerly sent by me under the name of \textit{anglosaxonicus}, but which is now recognised as \textit{R. rudis}. This present plant is the form principally intended under \textit{R. macrophyllus} var. \textit{b. macrophyllus} of the ‘Flora of Herefordshire,’ p. 93.—W. H. Purchas. “I consider the former the typical plant, and should place the latter under my var. \textit{setulosus}, but it is less extreme (and so nearer to my var. \textit{raduloides}) than the Howle Hill plant which I had more particularly in view when describing \textit{setulosus}.”—W. M. Rogers.

\textit{R. anglosaxonicus}, var. \textit{setulosus}, Rogers. Quarry at the foot of the Bleak Wood, Ross, Hereford, July, 1892. This is the \textit{R. Kochleri}
b. infestus of the 'Flora of Herefordshire.' The bush from which these specimens were taken had become more luxuriant than in the previous year when I examined it in company with the Rev. W. Moyle Rogers.—W. H. PURCHAS.

Rubus hystrix, Weihe. Near Shirley, S. Derby, September, 1892. Confirmed by Mr. Rogers. I send this up because (1) the plant hitherto regarded as hystrix, in Derbyshire, is most or all rosaceus, var. infecundus. (2) This is a variation from the plant in its narrow petals. (3) I have never received any good specimens of hystrix from the Club, and therefore judge such may be acceptable.—Wm. R. LINTON. Vales Wood, Ruyton XI Towns, Salop, 24th Sep., 1892.—E. F. LINTON.

R.' hystrix, Weihe? Old quarries, Hanham, W. Gloucester, 17th July, 1892; and by the Avon, near Brislington, N. Somerset, 29th August, 1892.—J. W. WHITE. Both (the Hanham plant especially) just what I mean by 'R. rosaceus, var. infecundus' in 'Journ. Bot.,' 1892, p. 338; as are the Rev. W. R. Linton's plants (so labelled) from 'near Shirley, S. Derbyshire,' Sep., 1892.—W. M. Rogers. Mr. White sent a note headed "R. rosaceus, W. & N., var. infecundus, Rogers [this is the plant], labelled R. hystrix, the name under which this plant was formerly known."

R. praeruptorum, Boul. Near Wareham, Dorset, 25th July, 1892. Named originally by Prof. Babington, and adopted as the English type for our set of 'British Rubi.'—E. F. LINTON. Bere Wood, Dorset, 5th August, 1892.—R. P. MURRAY.

R. scaber, W. & N. Near the Avon, under Sneyd Park, below Bristol, West Gloucester, 7th September, 1892.—J. W. WHITE. "This is normal W. England R. adornatus, P. J. Muehl, identical with Mr. Murray's plant from Sutton Holms, Dorset (see below)."—W. M. Rogers.

R. scaber, W. & N. f. teste Rev. W. Moyle Rogers. Crowell, Oxon, September, 1892.—G. C. DRUCE.

R. scaber, W. & N. (Assented to as a north country form, not very typical, by Dr. Focke and W. Moyle Rogers.) Near Belper, S. Derby, 22nd September, 1892. Not feeling satisfied with this as representing typical scaber I sent it to Dr. Focke, who replied:—“Looks very different from the typical plant, but after a careful comparison I think it will prove to be a shadegrown form of that species.” I quite fall in with this view.—E. F. LINTON. Do. var., wood, near Tintern, W. Gloucester, 31st August, 1892.—AUGUSTIN LEY. Sandstone quarry, same locality and same date.—W. A. SHOOLBRED. Watersmeet, in the neighbourhood of Lynmouth, N. Devon, 26th September, 1891.—CHARLES BAILEY. “I am afraid that none of these can be accepted as near typical scaber, though probably that name in an aggregate sense may be rightly applied to them all. The Tintern plant seems identical with one from the same locality named for me "R. scaber, W. & N. var."", by Dr. Focke. Of the Watersmeet plant I have seen only a panicle.”—W. M. Rogers.

R. fuscus, W. & N. var. Near Shirley, S. Derby, August, and September, 1892. Mr. Rogers prefers to put this under fuscus whilst
remarking that it approaches *scaber* in being much less hairy, in its finer leaf toothed, and in its more subracemose lower branches. Dr. Focke remarks, “Not typical *scaber*, but near it.”—Wm. R. Linton.


*R. rudis*, Weihe. In small quantity, but very fine, near Woburn Sands, Bucks, 30th September, 1892.—New County Record.—E. F. Linton. Hen Wood, Berks, September, 1892.—G. C. Druce. New County Record.

*R. Newbouldii*, Bab. Vales Wood, Ruyton XI Towns, Salop, 17th and 24th September, 1892. This was named for me by Rev. W. Moyle Rogers, who had it from the neighbouring county of Cheshire. It was in plenty in the wood, and was a new and distinct form to me.—E. F. Linton.


*R. Lejeunei*, Weihe. The Hobbie, Clovelly, N. Devon, 29th July, 1892.—J. W. White. “No doubt the plant referred to by Dr. Focke in ‘Journ. Bot.’ 1890, p. 132, as ‘a very hairy var.’ of *R. Lejeunei*. It however appears to me absolutely identical with the ‘*R. Rhenanus* P. J. Muell.” (*R. thyrsiger*, Bab. prius) of the Plymouth neighbourhood, and considerably different from the ‘*R. Lejeunei*’ which Mr. Briggs and Dr. Focke brought me from S. Devon in 1889.”—W. M. Rogers.


*R. fuscoc-ater*, Weihe, fide Dr. Focke. Near Shirley, S. Derbyshire, September, 1892.—W. R. Linton. “If this is the ordinary ‘English *fuscoc-ater*’ (and the only point in which the specimens seem to differ from the description in ‘Bab. Man.,’ Ed. 8, is the narrower its. not ‘all imbricate’), then *R. badius*, Focke, is probably still unknown here, as that (v. ‘Journ. Bot.,’ 1892, p. 341) has ‘st. sparsely hairy’ and ‘stalks of its. shorter.’ It is evident, judging from all the *fuscoc-ater* descriptions (‘broadly cordate’ Babington, ‘broadly elliptic or orbicular’ Focke), as well as from the plate in ‘Rubi. Germ.’ that the its. in Mr. Linton’s plant are exceptionally narrow. In toothed they come nearer to the ‘irregularly or rather doubly dentate’ of ‘Bab. Man.’ than to Focke’s ‘rather evenly and finely serrate.’ Focke now
places fusco-ater as a subordinate form allied to R. hystrix. From that, however, it may be readily distinguished by its far greater hairiness and the stronger, more abundant, and more unequal prickles.”—W. M. Rogers. The Rev. W. R. Linton remarks that the petals are remarkably deep rich pink, stamens crimson, styles green, stem dark red, hairy, leaflets dark dull green. A new Record for the County.


Thickets, Alltgoch, Radnor, 26th August, 1892.—Augustin Ley.


*R. saxicolus*, P. J. Muell. St. Leonard’s Forest, Holmibush, Sussex, 18th August, 1892.—J. W. White. “Clearly a larger state of a plant of Mr. White’s from the same locality, for which in November, 1891, Dr. Focke’s suggestion was: ‘A small var. of *R. saxicolus?*’”—W. M. Rogers.


*R. dumetorum ferox*, Weihe. Ashford, N. Devon, July and August, 1892.—W. H. Painter. Near Shirley, S. Derbyshire, 10th August, 1892.—W. R. Linton. “Rightly named, I believe; but there is often difficulty in getting specimens of this variable plant all equally good from one locality, and these mostly represent it but indifferently.”—W. M. Rogers.

*R. castus*, L., var. *laciniata*, Focke. Near Pencraig, Llangef, Anglesey, July, 1892. Do., var. *arvalis*, Focke. Near Bangor, April, 1892.—J. E. Griffith. “Apparently what is meant here is that Dr. Focke has named these plants respectively var. (or forma) *laciniata* and var. *arvalis*, Rchbch. A brief description (in German) of the latter will be found in Focke’s ‘Syn. R. G.,’ p. 416. The former, I suppose, is merely a somewhat lacinate-leaved strong form of *castus*, though the panicle looks as if it might have some connection with *R. corlyfolius*, Sm.”—W. M. Rogers.

*R. Lindleianus × Radula*. Near Shirley, S. Derby, 2nd September, 1892. Observed during three seasons. The two parents are the commonest brambles in its vicinity.—Wm. R. Linton.

*R. calvatus × pubescens*. Near Shirley, S. Derby, September, 1891 and 1892, No. 67. Mr. Rogers accepts the hybridity, but thinks one parent must be a glandulose bramble. After another season’s observation I still consider the above the correct parentage.—Wm. R. Linton.

*R. nemoralis × Sprengelii*. Near Shirley, S. Derby, September, 1892. This plant is sterile, intermediate between the two species, both of which were growing with it.—Wm. R. Linton. Respecting the hybrids *R. Lindleianus × Radula, R. calvatus × pubescens, and R. nemoralis × Sprengelii*, sent by Rev. W. R. Linton. The Rev. W. Moyle Rogers writes:—“That, while I see no reason to dissent from the suggestion of W. R. Linton in each case, I do not feel justified in giving an opinion either way positively without seeing the plant in question in situ, or having far more material before me to judge from.”
Rubus longithyrsiger × rosaceus. Chard Common, Somerset, 19th Aug., 1892.—R. P. Murray. This certainly looks like what one would expect in 'R. longithyrsiger × rosaceus,' but I must add that it seems identical, but for the ashy felted panicle leaves (which would be strange in such a hybrid), with a splendid plant which the Rev. A. Ley showed me in some quantity in Linton Wood, Herefordshire, last summer, and which Dr. Focke pronounced "near the Continental R. hirtus, W.K."—W. M. Rogers. Rev. R. P. Murray says "it was a very handsome plant, I have no doubt the name on the label is correct. Both parents grew freely in the immediate vicinity. Only one bush was seen which was nearly sterile, although a few drupelets had formed here and there."


Dryas octopetala, L., var. pilosa, Bab. Castle Taylor, county Galway, 16th May, 1892.—H. C. Levinge. "I have not seen a specimen from Professor Babington, but this seems to answer his description in most of the points."—Arth. Bennett.


Potentilla norvegica, L. Ash heap, Woolwich Arsenal, Kent, July, 1892.—A. Wolley-Dod.


P. Sibbaldi, Haller, f. Glen Aan, Banff, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

Alchemilla vulgaris, L., var. glabra, Wimm. et Grab. Corrie, near Aonach Mor, Glen Spean, Westernness, August, 1891. See 'Annals of Scottish Nat. Hist.,' January, 1893, pp. 32-37, where I have pointed out that the names of our *Alchemilla* in the Lond. Cat. require emendation, i.e., *Alchemilla vulgaris*, L., var. b. *glabra*, Wimm. et Grab.; and var. c. *montana* (Willd.) —? There is some doubt whether the latter is really a British plant. In 'Fl. Nied. Öst.,' Beck considers the plant of Wimmer and Grabowski to be identical with the *A. conglomerata*, Schmidt, 'Fl. Boem.' iv. 89 (1789), and reduces it to the variety *conglomerata* of *A. vulgaris*. Mr. N. E. Brown suggests that the var. *montana* of Willdenow is identical with the var. *hybrida*, Linn., but this, according to A. von Kerner, is not the case, Linnæus basing his var. *hybrida* essentially on Barrelier's *Alchemilla minor hirsuta cinerita*, and his remarks in 'Hort. Cliff.' would lead us to think of the hybrid form between *A. vulgaris* and *A. alpina*, which Christ has named *A. splendens*, or of the *Alchemilla* which M. Bieberstein calls *A. pubescens*, which is found over a large area on the mountains of southern Europe, (including Mount Ventoux), and which agrees well with Barrelier's figure, but which we have no evidence as yet to justify us in calling a British plant, or indeed, according to Kerner, of identifying it with the plant Willdenow called.
A. montana, to which it is physiognomically allied. There is an older A. pubescens, viz., 'Lam. Illust.' i. 347 (1791), which is not the plant of Bieberstein. The latter has the leaves both on the lower side and on the margin, when fully grown, permanently clothed with a dense overlay of silky soft hairs. The flower stalks, also, and the outer side of the calyx lips, which are glabrous in A. vulgaris, are densely covered with grey hairs. I have seen no British specimen, as yet, of Willdenow's plant.—G. C. Druce.

Rosa tomentosa, Sm. var. pseudo-mollis, E. Baker. Boar's Hill, Berks, August, 1892.—G. C. Druce. "See 'Journ Bot.,' November, 1892, p. 341. My specimens gathered in September when I pointed out the rose to Mr. J. G. Baker in Berks [not Oxon, as stated in 'Journ Bot.'], have been sent to M. Crépin, but I defer giving his opinion until I have supplied him with material gathered earlier in the season. It is the plant recorded as R. mollis in the 'Report of Bot. Rec. Club,' 1880, p. 144, but which Dr. F. A. Lees said 'has the prickles on the fruit-bearing branch (that alone sent), to my eyes, suspiciously stout and curved, but in other respects it seems typical.' Smith is usually considered to be the author of R. tomentosa cf. 'Fl. Brit.' vol. ii, 539 (1800). Mr. Baker writes R. tomentosa, Woods. To my eyes this plant is a link between R. mollis and R. subglobose, Sm."—G. C. Druce.


R. canina, L. var. Heanton Punchardon, N. Devon, July, 1892.—W. H. Painter. Fruit, Sep. 21, 1892. Coll. W. P. Hiern. "This is a well marked rose. Other bushes besides this one from which these specimens were cut were seen in the district, but their leaves were not so pointed. I think it is near collina, Jacq., possibly it may be Kosinciana, Besser."—W. H. Painter. "R. canina, L. var. frondosa."—J. G. Baker. "Is R. systyla, Bast., a form with less prominent disc and less glandular pedicels than usual."—W. Moyle Rogers. "C'est une variété du R. stylosa, Desv., à feuilles presque glabres se rapprochant aussi du groupe de variations à feuilles glabres, qui comprend les R. rusticana, Déség., et R. levestyla, Rip. Dans ces échantillons, les styles ne sont pas restés unis pour former une colonne styilaire, mais se sont séparés et pourraient ainsi tromper le botaniste qui ne connaît pas bien le R. stylosa."—F. Crépin.


P. Aria, Sm. Nightingale Valley, Clifton, Somerset, 15th June, 1892. This must, I suppose, be referred to type P. Aria, Sm., of which it seems to be a variety with leaf lobes deeper than usual.—
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Augustin Ley. "Is eu-Aria."—J. Gilbert Baker. "I cannot see in what way these differ from \textit{P. eu-Aria}. I have undoubted eu-Aria (seen in flower and fruit) from the Surrey Downs that have the base of the leaf as rounded and as tapering as any of these, and even more rounded than any of the leaves figured by Mr. N. E. Brown in \textit{E. B. Supp.' \textit{t. 483a, as P. rotundifolia, Bechst. (=P. latifolia, Syme.) so much so, as almost to be called subrotund, but the tomentum and veining that of eu-Aria. The cutting of the leaves of Mr. Ley's specimens is also to be matched in eu-Aria."—Arth. Bennett. Similar specimens were named \textit{P. Arizia} by Syme. Ehrhart appears to be the authority. See the 'Beitr.,' vol. iv., p. 20, 1789.—G. C. Druce.

\textit{Saxifraga rivularis}, Linn. Aonach Mor, Westerness, August, 1891. Cairngorm, Easterness, not Banff, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

\textit{S. Sternbergii}, Willd.? On rocks near Blackhead, co. Clare, 19th May, 1892.—H. C. Levine. "Yes."—J. G. Baker. Mr. N. E. Brown says this name should be replaced by that of \textit{S. decipiens}, Ehrh., with which he says it is synonymous, but I have yet to be convinced that the Irish plant distributed above is identical with the Welsh \textit{S. decipiens}.—G. C. Druce. "A saxifrage which I have in cultivation side by side with the Brandon forms, from all of which it differs markedly in habit. It appears to me to be a new variety or species."—W. R. Linton.

\textit{Ribes nigrum}, L. Pangbourne, Berks, July, 1892.—G. C. Druce.


\textit{Lythrum hyssopifolium}, L. Waste damp ground, Foss Islands, York, August, 1889.—J. A. Wheldon. Linnaeus wrote \textit{L. Hyssopifolia}. Smith changed it to \textit{L. hyssopifolium}. The plant, a single specimen in bad condition, was only of casual origin.—G. C. Druce.

\textit{Epilobium hirsutum}, L. Flowers nearly white. Southport, 28th August, 1892.—J. A. Wheldon.


\textit{E. montanum \times roseum}. These two parents were growing as weeds in a damp kitchen garden, and the specimens forwarded come from two roots of a good intermediate hybrid. Swansea, Glamorgan, July, 1892.—E. F. Linton. Rev. E. S. Marshall assents to this name.

\textit{E. \textit{—}}, Railway bank, Lydbrook, West Gloucestershire, 15th August, 1892. I cannot name this \textit{Epilobium} with any satisfaction to myself. It does not appear to agree with any form of \textit{E. roseum}, Schreb., which I possess, nor with specimens of \textit{E. montanum \times roseum}. In the locality from which I send it, it was in company with \textit{Erysimum orientale}, R. Br., and other aliens; but a precisely similar plant grew on a bank about half a mile away, where no circumstances suggested introduction.—Augustin Ley. "\textit{E. roseum}, a state of poor dry soil,
I believe. If a hybrid, then with *obscum*, but I think not.” — E. S. Marshall.

*Epilobium montanum*, L. forma *minor*, Haussk. Glen Spean, near the Bridge of Spean, Westerness, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

*E. tetragonum*, Linn., forma *stenophylla*. Near Bray, Berks, July, 1891.—G. C. Druce.


*Ludwigia palustris*, Elliott. New Forest, Hants, June, 1885.—G. C. Druce.

*Astrantia major*, L. Woods above Stokesay Castle, Salop, August, 1892.—G. C. Druce.

*Trinia vulgaris*, DC. St. Vincent’s Rock, Gloster W., August, 1879. Its earlier name is *T. glaberrima*, Hoffm.—G. C. Druce.


*Galium boreale*, L. forma *oreinum*, Melvill. Ben Laoigh, W. Perth, at 2,000 feet, 31st July, 1891.—J. Cosmo Melvill. See ‘Rep.’ for 1891, p 337. Is it anything more than a stunted form? I found a plant reverting from the type in the opposite direction from this. It grew amid *Vaccinium myrtillus* in Glenmore, and from its large leaves and lax habit suggested *Rubia* when seen from a distance. Has Mr. Melvill cultivated it?—G. C. Druce.


*G. Mollugo*, L., var. *insubricum* (Gaud.) fide Arthur Bennett. Howth to Dublin, 24th June, 1892.—H. C. Levinge. “*Insubricum* and *Bakeri* appear to be substantially the same.” —J. Gilbert Baker. “I have not seen a specimen from Gaudin, but this seems to be the plant so called. Its proper varietal name would probably be *G. Mollugo* var. *latifolium*, Sonder (1851), which is pre-occupied by var. *latifolium*, Wallroth (1822), and which is likely the same plant. Is not the var. *Bakeri*, Syme, the same as the var. *angustifolium* of Leyssers’ *Flora Halensis*’ (1761)? For a full account by Mr. Baker of Syme’s plant see ‘Journ. Bot.,’ 1863, p. 290-3.”—Arthur Bennett. Leyser in ‘Flora Halensis,’ Ed. i., p. 23 (1761, preface dated 1760), gave no names to the varieties of *Galium Mollugo*; in Ed. ii., p. 37 (1783), he cited *G. Mollugo angustifolia* from Leers’ ‘Fl. Herbonensis,’ No. 115. If the identity be correct the varietal
name should be cited as of Leers not of Leyser. Syme, it must be remembered, described his Bakeri as a variety of the subspecies G. elatum, Thuillier.—G. C. Druce.

Galium Mollugo, L., var. Bakeri, Syme. Upton Wood, Warwick, August, 1891.—H. Bromwich. “In diffuseness of the panicles and straggling habit, this seems to accord with Bakeri, but the leaves are lanceolate, not ‘strap shaped,’ or ‘linear strap shaped,’ as described by Syme. Some specimens distributed in 1878 by Mr. Cunnack from the station, given by Mr. Bromwich, have the leaves oblanceolate on the main stem, and obviously cannot be Syme’s plant. The plant, without a name, distributed by Mr. Bolton King, from ‘Old Windsor,’ in 1879, seems to me to much more accord with Baker’s description, that is a plant having somewhat intermediate characters, but perhaps better placed to the former on the whole. The leaves, however, of Mr. B. King’s plant are recurved, and Mr. Baker does not say they are so in his plant.”—Arth. Bennett.

G. sylvestre, Pollich, var. nitidulum (Thuill.) Sulham, Berks, August, 1891. Probably this should be called var. Bocconii (G. Boccone, All. ‘Fl. Ped.’ i. 624), Coss. et Germ., ‘Fl. Par.’ 446, 1861.—G. C. Druce.

G. palustre, L., var. elongatum (Presl.) Jouldern’s Ford, Berks, July, 1891.—G. L. Druce.

G. palustre, L., var. Witheringii (Sm.) Boat of Garten, Easterness, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

G. uliginosum, L. Childswell Hill, Berks, July, 1880. This habitat was mentioned by Dillenius about 1730.—G. C. Druce.

Solidago angustifolia. Buddon Wood, on syenite, Leicestershire, 5th August, 1892. In the ‘Report’ for 1891, the Editor remarks that the specimens which I sent from Lancashire and Leicestershire are “the plant figured in ‘English Botany’ as var. genuina, not angustifolia.” This is true, but the figure does not agree with the description in the text, and both figure and text differ from the description in the ‘Student’s Flora.’ My specimens are the var. angustifolia, Gaud., as given in the ‘Student’s Flora.’ I send a further supply of Leicestershire specimens.—F. T. Mott. Mr. J. Gilbert Baker says: “typical Virgaurea.” As Mr. Mott says, the description of the varieties of Solidago Virgaurea differ from the plate which is supposed to do duty for the typical plant, i.e., var. vulgaris, Koch, which is said to have “upper leaves lanceolate . . . entire.” In the plate they are represented as distinctly serrate. In the ‘Student’s Flora’ the leaves are said to be “all oblong obovate, quite entire” in the type plant, which, if they answer to the description, would be the var. latifolia, of Koch, while the var. angustifolia, of Gaudin, Hooker says, has the leaves oblong lanceolate, upper narrower, often serrate. Babington says the var. angustifolia, Koch, has all the leaves lanceolate, which would exclude Mr. Mott’s plant. Gaudin’s own description in ‘Fl. Helv.’ v. 316 (1829), is “folii angustioribus obscurius serratis,” which is based on the Virga-aurea angustifolia, C.B.P. and Hall., Helv. 69b. In the ‘Enum. Stirpes Helv.’ 729 (1742), Haller says: “var. b., quæ videtur in Anglia et
Gallia frequentius nasci, crenis foliorum obscurioribus." He gives, among other synonyms, *Virga-aurea angustifolia minus serrata*, H. Ox. iii., p. 125. Haller describes the type *Virgaurea* as having "folio lato, subhirsuto, serrato, caule sepedali." Morison describes his plant (of which there is no specimen extant), cited by Haller, "Hec cum proxime antecedenti [S. Virgaurea] convenit at folio habet minora, angustiora, sine crenis aut saltem crenis minus conspicuis praedita, alias a vulgari non differentia." In the 'Icones Fl. Helv. et Germ,' vol. xvi., page 8, Reichenbach describes his var. *a. angustifolia* as "gracilis, flaccida, glabriuscula foliis omnibus sublineari lanceolatis, ex Hispania obtinui." In the 'Syn. Fl. Germ et Helv.,' vol. i., 390 (1843), Koch says: "var. *angustifolia* elatiofoliis omnibus lanceolatis obscurius serratus vel integerrimus." From the above citations we learn that the description in the 'Student's Flora' of the variety is not correct, and that if we cite var. *angustifolia*, Gaud., it must be represented by a plant with narrow lanceolate leaves whose margins are entire or obscurely crenated. With neither of these characters do Mr. Mott's specimens agree, and to me his plant is simply *Solidago Virgaurea*, L.—G. C. Druce.

*Aster paniculatus*, Lamarck. Oxford, Sept. 1892. Prof. Asa Gray informed me that this was the name he should give to the plant.—G. C. Druce.

*Erigeron alpinum*, L. Glen Dole, Forfar, 1885.—G. C. Druce.

*Filago apiculata*, G. E. Sm. Near Padworth, Berks, August, 1892.—G. C. Druce.


*G. luteo-album*, L. Jersey, wood near the sea, 3rd August, 1892.—M. L. Hodgson. No; these specimens are the North American *Gnaphalium polycephalum*, Michaux, which Mr. F. J. Richards first brought me from Jersey in 1888, and which I had some difficulty in running down to the unexpected western species. It is described in Asa Gray's 'Manual of Botany' p. 268, and is said to be common in the States, "in old fields and woods." Mr. Richards said it appeared to be quite naturalized in Jersey.—G. C. Druce.

*Anthenis nobilis*, L. Near Bracknell, Berks, September, 1892.—G. C. Druce.

*Chrysanthemum coronarium*, L. Ballast by the canal, Hunslet, Leeds, August, 1891.—J. A. Wheldon.

*Artemisia campestris*, L. Near Lakenheath, Suffolk, August, 1883.—G. C. Druce.

*Doronicum Pardalianches*, L. Near Buscot, Berks, July, 1892. New County Record, but as a naturalized plant only, as the locality is really an extension of the pleasure grounds.—G. C. Druce.

*Senecio vulgaris × squallidus = × S. Baxterii*, mihi. Nearer vulgaris than some other hybrids of these species which I have found on waste ground, growing with both of the assumed parents, about Oxford. July, 1892.—G. C. Druce. "The facies seem fully to warrant the above determination. I think hybrids are rather scarce in *Compositae."—E. F. Marshall.
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Arctium intermedium, Lange, var. subtomentosum, Lange. Near Bodorgan Station, Anglesey, 7th July, 1892. Named by Mr. Arthur Bennett.—J. E. Griffith.

Centaurea paniculata, L. St. Ouens Bay, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.


C. biennis, L. Near Wakerley, Northants native. Also near Streatley, Berks, June, 1892. New County Record for the latter county, where it is only a colonist, introduced with grass seeds.—G. C. Druce.

Hieracium holosericeum, Backh. Near Aonach, Mor, Westerness, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

H. extinuum, Backh., var. tenellum, Backh. Glen A'an, Banff, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.


H. lingulatum, Backh. Beinn Chaoruinn, Westerness, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

H. chrysanthum, Backh. Glen A'an, Banff, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

H. anglicum, Fries. Glen Spean, Westerness, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

H. Schmidtii, Tausch. Nant Francon, Carnarvonshire. This flowers about a fortnight later than H. Sommerfeltii, 14th July, 1892.—J. E. Griffith.


H. Sommerfeltii, Lindeb. Nant Francon, 14th July, 1892.—J. E. Griffith.


H. lasiophyllum, var. euryodon, Hanb. Clova, Forfar, July, 1890.—W. R. Linton. "The shape of the involucre and phyllaries, and the texture of the leaves preclude, I think, the possibility of regarding this as any form of H. lasiophyllum, Koch. From the single weak specimen sent me, I dare not venture a name."—F. J. Hanbury.

H. argenteum, Fr., f. latifolia. Llanberis, Carnarvon, July, 1892.—J. E. Griffith.

H. murorum, L. Glen Dole, Forfar, August, 1884.—G. C. Druce.


H. —. Great Orme’s Head, August, 1892.—J. A. Wheldon.

“Is H. caesium, Fries.”—F. J. Hanbury.


H. Farrense, Hanb. West bank of river, near Thurso; also sea cliffs between Thurso and Scrabster, Caithness, Aug., 1892.—W. A. Schoolbred. “Correct.”—F. J. Hanbury.


H. scaphilum, Uechtr. Near Shirley, S. Derbyshire, Aug., 1892.—W. R. Linton. “I concur in this naming, but prefer for the present at any rate to regard it as a variety of H. vulgatum, Fries, rather than as a separate species, and in so doing follow most continental authors.”—F. J. Hanbury.

H. rubicundum, F. J. H. Moffat, Dumfries; cultivated, 1892. This was sent up in 1890 as oreades var., latifolia and thought to be Schmidtii, Tausch. It appears now to me to be good rubicundum.—W. R. Linton. “I cannot regard this as any form of rubicundum, especially is the wild specimen very different. The narrow ciliate marginal leaves and fairly numerous heads and argenteum-like involucres point to a plant nearer H. oreades, Fries, of which Mr. Linton has already distributed fine specimens from this part. The broad stem leaf is certainly not characteristic of oreades.”—F. J. Hanbury.

H. rubicundum, Hanb. Ystolion Duon, July, 1892.—J. E. Griffith; also from E. coast of Caithness, 1888; and cult., 1892.—W. R. Linton. The latter specimens alone seen by Mr. F. J. Hanbury, and marked by him as correct.


Hieracium diaphanoides, Lindeb. Railway embankment, Conway, May, 1892.—J. E. Griffith. Beresford Lane, near Alstonfield, North Staffordshire, August, 1889.—W. H. Purchas. Rocky bank, Mangotsfield, West Gloucester, 20th July, 1892.—J. W. White. “These specimens of Mr. White’s are poor and insufficient, and are probably only a starved vulgatum form.”—F. J. Hanbury. Referring to Mr. Griffith’s plant Mr. Hanbury says, “We appear to have in this country forms intermediate between H. vulgatum and H. diaphanoides, Lind., which form a connecting link. In this plant we have the dark phyllaries, densely clothed with setæ, and almost or quite destitute of simple hairs, but the presence of stellate hairs in considerable quantity, prevent it from being placed to typical H. diaphanoides. The radical leaves moreover are abruptly narrowed instead of being gradually decurrent into the petiole. The only British examples I possess that really agree well with the type (No. 123 H. Sc. Exs.) are from the neighbourhood of Settle and from Upper Teesdale.”

H. vulgatum, Fr., var. rubescens, Backh. Scaleber, W. Yorks., August, 1892, H. vulgatum, var. sciaphilum, Uechtr.—J. A. Wheldon. “These specimens agree even more closely than Mr. Linton’s, Dr. Shoobred’s, or Mr. White’s with the Austrian specimens, of which I have a fine series collected by F. Schultz and C. Baenitz. I have known the plant for years as a peculiar limestone form, prevalent in Derbyshire, but it is to Rev. W. R. Linton’s suggestion that I owe its identification. F. Schultz says, ‘solo calcareo.’ The wiry, arcuate, densely floccose and setose peduncles are very striking, as is also the clothing of the narrow, cuneate involucres.”—F. J. Hanbury. “A form of sciaphilum, Uechtr.”—W. R. Linton.


H. auratum, Fr. Glen Spean, Westerness, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.


H. umbellatum, L. f. latifolium, Hanb. Near Bangor, August, 1892.—J. E. GRIFFITH.

Hypochceris glabra, L. Sandy field, east of Rillingston, S.E. York, Sep., 1892.—GEORGE WEBSTER. "A new record for the county of York, the records of "63 and 64" in Top. Bot. being more than doubtful; see Lees ‘Fl. W. Yorkshire,' p. 299."—Arth. Bennett. The type plant with the outer achenes destitute of a beak. The var. arachnoides Coss. et. Germ., with all the achenes beakless has not yet been recorded as British—G. C. Druce.


Tragopogon pratensis, L. var. grandiflorus, Syme." Railway bank, Burton Green, Warwickshire, June, 1892.—H. BROMWICH. A single specimen lacking the lower portion of the stem of T. orientalis, L. The exterior fruits being bristly and the flowers retaining their bright yellow colour after drying. Günther Beck makes this a var. of T. pratensis in 'Fl. Südboesnien,' p. 167.—G. C. Druce.

Jasione montana, L. var. Sandhills, Wallasey, Cheshire, 18th August, 1892.—J. A. WHELDON. I do not see that this is a variety, it is very different from the plants distributed through the Club as var. littoralis, Fries.—G. C. Druce.


Erica Mackayi, Hook. Craig-a-more, near Roundstone, Connemara, 27th August, 1892. Legit. B. King; comm.—H. C. LEVINGE. "Mr. Levinge adopts the cabalistic 'Hk.,' which may stand for Haskarl, as well as Hooker and others."—Arthur Bennett. I think Hooker spelled this Mackayi in 'Comp. to Bot. Mag.,' 158, 1835.—G. C. Druce.

Statice Limonium, L., pyramidalis, Syme. Wells, Norfolk, 23rd August, 1892.—Coll. F. Long. The variety grows with the type, but it does not come into full flower for at least three weeks to a month later.—H. D. GELDART. Syme refers this to the S. Limonium, a, genuina; Boiss. in 'DC. Prod.'—at present I have not been able to see a specimen named by Boissier; but from my own observations in Kent, I am strongly inclined to agree with Syme in thinking that it is the more or less dryness of the saltmarsh that produces the var. Syme considers the serotina, Reich., to be the S. Limonium, v. macroclada, Boiss., and different from the above plant; while he refers the serotina of Gren. and Godr. 'Fl. France' to the Norfolk plant."—Arthur Bennett.

Erythrea littoralis, Fries., var. minor, Hartm. Inver bay, near Tain, E. Ross, 16th July, 1891.—E. S. MARSHALL. The plant I
recorded as *A. littoralis* from Munlochy, in the Black Isle of Cromarty, in "Rep. of Rec. Club," 1881, p. 193. The same form as above is figured in 'E. B.' No. 2305, as *E. littoralis* from the Elgin coast.—G. C. Druce.

*Gentiana germanica*, Willd. Letcombe Castle, Berkshire, September, 1892.—G. C. Druce. "Yes."—Arthur Bennett. It grew in great profusion over a limited area with *G. Amarella*, and with a few plants of what I believe to be a hybrid, *i.e.* *G. Amarella × germanica*, = × *G. Pamplinii*. In this locality a good deal of *G. Amarella* continued in flower with *G. germanica*; usually it is an earlier flowering plant. The obconical tube of the flower of *G. germanica* fully distinguishes it from the nearly cylindric tube of *G. Amarella*. The hybrid was certainly somewhat intermediate in character, but I have sent it to Dr. Wettstein.—G. C. Druce.

*Cynoglossum officinale*, L. Var. *subglabrum*, Syme. Sandhills, Southport, July, 1892. Specimens sent are side branches and radical leaves of a very large plant, which was much less downy than our usual form, and entirely devoid of the usual mousy odour. I only found this one specimen which was much too large to dry entire.—J. A. Wheelon. "Very poor, but seemed what Syme meant by the var."—Arthur Bennett. The varietal name should be cited Bromfield in ‘Phytol.’ p. 571—1849 (not Syme) as he there reduces Mérat’s *C. subglabrum* to a variety of *C. officinale*; he says "it is merely a slight variety of the hound’s tongue, and in some specimens hardly to be distinguished from the common form."—G. C. Druce.

*C. montanum*, Lam. Wychwood, Oxon, January, 1885. In the absence of the flowers the swollen bases of the hairs will distinguish this plant from *C. officinale*, L. *C. germanicum*, Jacq., appears to be the older name.—G. C. Druce.

*Asperugo procumbens*, L. Rubbish heaps, Grandpont, Berks., August, 1891. Since lost.—C. C. Druce.

*Symphytum patens*, Sibth. Brass Knocker Hill, North Somerset, July, 1892. This is a much more distinctly marked variety than might be inferred from descriptions to be found in the text-books, none of which seem to be correct or complete. Its chief characters are a larger and more globular corolla of a pure blue colour mixed with white; broader leaves abruptly rounded at the base, and only slightly decurrent; and a less succulent stem bearing merely raised lines instead of prominent wings, as in the type. The figure in Syme’s ‘E. B.’ is a good one.—Jas. W. White. "Is typical officinale, not patens, which has a dark purple flower."—J. Gilbert Baker. As I have before pointed out, Sibthorp described his *S. patens* "folis ovato-lanceolatis decurrentibus, calyce patente tubo corollae breviori, the red flowered Comfrey." The *S. officinale* having "calyce convergenti tubi corollae longitudine." We have a specimen, labelled by Sibthorp *S. patens*, at Oxford, which I have recently examined with some amount of care. I fail to see that it answers Sibthorp’s description. The calyx is not more patent than the specimen which he labels *S. officinale*. His *S. patens* is a more luxuriant specimen than the rather dwarfer specimen of *S. officinale*, but it does not differ in the
slightest varietal sense (colour perhaps excepted) from the type. We might well erase *S. patens*, Sibth., from our lists. Whether the colour-forms—purple, blue, red or grey—be worth noting is very doubtful. Mr. H. Boswell quite agrees with me in the above conclusions.—G. C. Druce.

*Echium plantagineum*, Linn. St. Aubyn's bay, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.

*Solanum Lycopersicum*. In great abundance on a ballast heap at Aintree, Lancashire, with *Hyoscyamus, Datura*, etc. Flowering but producing no fruit. Sept., 1892.—J. A. WHELDON. *Lycopersicum esculentum*, Mönch.

*Datura Stramonium*, L. Casual, Northampton, 1879; Grandpont, Berks, Aug., 1890.—G. C. Druce.


*L. repens x vulgaris*. Chalk ballast, Oxford, July to September, 1892. The series of hybrids represented by the above name would be a good object lesson to the botanists who disbelieve in the occurrence of natural hybrids. The history of the plants distributed under the above name is recent, and beyond contradiction. Up to 1889 we had no locality for *L. repens*, Mill, near Oxford; but *L. vulgaris*, which was at that time fairly constant in character, was plentiful; but an alteration in the permanent way near the railway station at Oxford, led to a large quantity of chalk ballast being brought from the chalk cutting below Didcot to fill up a portion of ground between the L.N.W.R. and G.W.R. lines. In 1890 *L. repens, Iberis amara, Hippocrepis comosa*, appeared in quantity side by side with our own *L. vulgaris*. The following year numerous hybrids of *L. repens* and *L. vulgaris* appeared, but the plants were nearer *L. repens* than *L. vulgaris*. In 1892 a most complete chain of intermediates was found, from *L. repens* with an increase of yellow on the lip to *L. vulgaris* with the faintest striae on the flower. Seeds of a hybrid about $\frac{2}{3}$ *repens* and $\frac{1}{3}$ *vulgaris* proved fertile, but the plants which appeared were merely *L. repens*; but this simply verifies Dr. Romanes' experiment on the breeding of rats, *i.e.*, the offspring of the wild brown rat, and the albino were not piebald but brown. The offspring of these brown descendants of the white and brown rat, however, yielded piebald rats. Botanists have usually been satisfied with trials of one generation. I am anxious to see if the offspring of the *L. repens* yielded by *L. vulgaris x repens* will be true *L. repens* or again revert to the hybrid or to either of the parents. A curious fact is also elicited that what was a fairly constant plant, *i.e.*, *L. vulgaris*, before the introduction of this disturbing element, is now, since the occurrence of *L. repens*, proving to be a very variable plant in the direction and shape of the spur, and to some extent in the
colouring of the flowers and in the width of the leaves. That is, a concolorous form is frequent, and also an extreme discolor form, where in contradistinction to the almost white flower, is the large and richly orange coloured palate. The shape and direction of the spur is now found to be excessively variable, as is also the width of the leaves. In these cases no striæ are visible on the flowers, so that we cannot say they are hybrids, but it may be that the pollen of L. repens has exerted some influence upon the mother plant, but that the L. vulgaris element has been prepotent. One of the hybrids, distinguished on the label as L. Baxterii, named after the author of ‘Phenogamous Botany,’ is nearer L. vulgaris, but the striæ are distinctly visible on the flowers. It occurred with the others at Oxford, September, 1892.—G. C. Druce.


S. umbrosa, Dum. Wood near Ludlow, Salop, August, 1892.—G. C. Druce.

S. Scorodonia, L. St. Aubyn’s Bay, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.

Mimulus guttatus, DC. Stream side, Reay, Caithness, August, 1892.—W. A. Shoolbred. Not specifically distinct from M. luteus, L.—G. C. Druce.

Veronica persica, Poir. Waste heap in the road from the Beacon-hill, and Barbery Plains to the high road to Eden Hall, near Penrith, Cumberland, 24th July, 1892. Not recorded for Vice-county 70 in ‘Topographical Botany,’ ed. ii., p. 292.—Charles Bailey. The oldest name appears to be V. Tournefortii, Gmel.—G. C. Druce.

V. saxatilis, L. Ben Lawers, Mid Perth, Aug., 1889. V. fruticans, Jacq., ‘Hort. Vind.,’ p. 200, appears to be an earlier name.—G. C. Druce.

V. scutellata, L. var. parrmularia, (Turp et Poit.). Edge Green, near Malpas, Cheshire, 1st Aug., 1892.—A. H. Wolley-Dod. Also from the vicinity of Wellington College, Berks. The name would appear to be V. scutellata, L., var. villosa, Schum. ‘Pl. Saell.,’ 1801. Would members note if they find the glabrous and hairy plants growing together?—G. C. Druce.


Odontites divergens, Jord. (?Bartsia Odontites, Huds., var. divergens, Balb.) Roadside, near Blackmore, Essex, 14th August, 1892.—A. H. Wolley-Dod. “Divergens is a variety of serotina.”—J. Gilbert Baker. “I have not seen var. divergens. Very near verna if not that.”—E. S. Marshall. Mr. F. Townsend does not distinguish between divergens and serotina.

Bartsia Odontites, Huds., var. Wallasey, Cheshire, 21st August, 1892. Is this divergens? The branches spread at right angles when growing, but having carried them a mile or two in my hand before putting between paper I found them gradually approaching the stem and
incurling at the top.—J. A. Wheldon. "I do not pretend to know these plants as represented on the Continent—the examples sent seem so far to accord with British Floras."—Arthur Bennett. *Odontites verna, O. serotina* and *O. divergens* are described in Boreau ‘Flore du Centre de la France,’ p. 490-1.—G. C. Druce.

*Bartsia alpina*, L. Widdy Bank, Durham, S., July, 1885.—G. C. Druce.

*Melampyrum pratense*, L. var. hians, Druce. Findhorn side, to Forres, Elgin, August, 1888. This appears singularly constant in character over its areas of distribution. The deep yellow flowered Irish plant requires further study, it appears to grade into the variety *latifolium* if indeed there be anything but a state induced by moisture and shade.—G. C. Druce.

*Orobanche elatior*, Sutton. Sheringham, Norfolk, July 9th, 1892.—H. D. Geldart. "Yes, the true plant of Sutton."—Arthur Bennett. Beck in the ‘Schedæ ad Fl. Aust.’ considers that the *O. major*, L., in ‘Fl. Suec.’ Ed. ii., 219 (1755), non alior, is the proper name to use for the plant we have been calling *O. elatior*, Sutton. The oldest name for the "Broom" Orobanche appears to be *O. Rapum-genistae*, Thuill. (and of Lobel), which Linnaeus in Ed. ii. of the ‘Sp. Pl.’ cites as a synonym of his *O. major*, which he there states is parasitic on the roots of Diadelphia, and for which and other reasons I should advocate the retention of *O. elatior*, Sutton, for the Orobanche parasitic on *Centaurea*, etc.—G. C. Druce.


*Mentha rotundifolia*, Linn, var. *Bauhini, Tenore, = M. rugosa*, Lam. Hindringham, Norfolk, 21st September, 1892. Variety new to Great Britain, found and communicated by F. Long. Mr. Frederick Long, of Wells, has known for some time of a patch of this mint growing on the side of a ditch mixed with grass, and *Agrimonia Eupatoria*, and which he thought differed from the type of *M. rotundifolia*, Linn. When shown to Mr. Arthur Bennett, he received it as above, adding “It has the leaves narrower than our usual plant, teeth deeper cut, more undulated, &c.”—H. D. Geldart. Hudson in ‘Fl. Anglica’ first described *M. rotundifolia*. Linnaeus cites Hudson in the 2nd Ed. i. of the ‘Sp. Pl.’—G. C. Druce.


Marrubium vulgare, L. Waste ground, Grandpont, Berks, 1888.—
G. C. Druce.

C. Druce.

Lamium purpureum, L. var. decipiens, Sonder. Pangbourne, Berks,
June, 1892.—G. C. Druce. "Not decipiens, a form with slighter
cut leaves than usual."—W. R. Linton. "Poor, but seems correct."—
Arthur Bennett.

Plantago arenaria, Waldst. et Kit. Waste ground, Foss Island,
York, Aug., 1889.—J. A. Wheldon.

Illecebrum verticillatum, L. Near Wellington College, Berks;
native. August, 1892. In the vicinity of the original station, but an
extension of its area.—G. C. Druce.

Scleranthus perennis L. Hucknold, Norfolk, July, 1885.—
G. C. Druce.

Chenopodium opulifolium, Schrad. Crossness, near Erith, Kent,
28th August, and 11th September, 1892.—A. H. Wolley-Dod.
Grandpont, Berks, August, 1892. Easily recognisable by its
rhomboidal leaves, of which no upper ones on the stem, which are not
conspicuously narrowed as is usual in C. album, and by its fruit with
an obtuse not acute border.—G. C. Druce.

C. opulifolium, Sm. Grandpont, Berks, September, 1891.—G. C.
Druce. New County Record.

C. hybridum, L. Eynsham, Oxford, September, 1892.—G. C.
Druce.

Atriplex deltoidea, Bab. Wytham, Berks, September, 1892.—
G. C. Druce.

A. deltoidea, f. Marcham, Berks, September, 1892. Mr. Baker
and myself when we saw it growing thought it was near A. triangularis,
Bab.—G. C. Druce. "Apparently A. deltoidea, Bab."—Arthur
Bennett.

Salicornia radicans, Sm. Holme — Norfolk, July, 1888.—
G. C. Druce.

Suaeda procumbens, Syme, (maritima, Dum. var. b.) Mud flats,
Ansdell, Lytham, W. Lancashire, August, 1891.—J. Cosmo Melvill.
"Doubtless right; but surely Syme did not describe this as a
species; hardly worth retaining, even as a var."—E. S. Marshall.
"In 'Eng. Bot.' Syme calls this S. maritima, b. procumbens, Syme
(1868), not as a species."—Arthur Bennett.

Polygonum —. Ballast at Aintree, Lancashire, 10th September,
1892. A remarkable pretty plant when growing, deep rose coloured
flowers on very slender pedicels. If avicularis at all, very different
from any I have ever seen before. Only two plants seen. On my
next visit, locality covered with mud dredged from canal.—J. A.
Wheldon. Cf. microsperma, Jord."—J. G. Baker. Rather like
P. graminifolium, Wierzb., in 'Flora,' 1842, but still I think not that
plant. The long slender pedicels and larger bright rosy coloured
flowers, and the less conspicuous stipules, mark it as a distinct
species which so far I have been unable to run down to any described
form.—G. C. Druce.
**Polygonum aviculare**, L., var. Marcham, Berks, August, 1892. Gathered in the company of Mr. J. Gilbert Baker, who thinks it var. littorale (Link.)—G. C. Druce. “It is var. agrestinum, I believe.”—Arthur Bennett. “I am afraid it will not do to call it var. littorale, which has seeds protruding much more, and rather larger. Without further examination, I should venture to call it ruivagum, which has nut a little longer than perianth. In fact, I think it is that. A similar plant used to come up as a weed in my garden at Sprowston, and at first I thought it was inland var. littorale.”—E. F. Linton. Mr. Marshall says “certainly not littorale.”

**P. mite** × **Persicaria**. Osney, Oxon, September, 1892.—G. C. Druce. “Looks probable, but I don’t know them critically.” E. S. Marshall. It grew with both parents, and I have little doubt of the correctness of the determination. It is not quite identical with the plants No. 1832 of the ‘Flora Exs. Aust. Hung.’ named P. axillare Rigo = mite × Persicaria, which has rather broader leaves.—G. C. Druce. Dr. Lange considers it to be correctly named.

**P. sagittifolium**, L. I sent this plant to the Club in 1889 under the name P. arifolium; it was then found growing abundantly on the stony bed of a small stream, just above tidal influence, at Castle Cove, Kenmare Bay. On re-visiting this locality with a friend last summer, a careful search could only discover one or two small plants still surviving on this flood-swept spot, while perhaps half a dozen more were found along the stream nearer the sea. Later in the day, when following an old deserted road across the mountains to Darrynane, we came across a small boggy hollow, quite filled with this prickly Polygonum. This new locality is about a mile north of Castle Cove and about 200 feet above sea-level. **Juncus tenuis**, another common American plant, occurs in great abundance near this locality. 22nd July, 1892.—R. W. Scully.


**R. acutus**, L. Sneyd Park, Clifton, West Gloucester, 13th July, 1892. This plant is frequently met with about Bristol, both in N. Somerset and West Gloucester.—Jas. W. White. “Yes.”—Arthur Bennett.
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Rumex crispus, L., subcordatus, Warren. Marshy meadow, Hill Wootton, Warwickshire, September, 1892.—H. Bromwich. "Seems to be the plant so named; but according to Dr. Boswell ('Exch. Club Report,' 1872-4, p. 36), Mr. Warren withdrew that name, and substituted that of dentatus (which he had the right to do, as the name was not then published), but Dr. Boswell remarks, "The denticulation at the base of the petals is not a constant character."—Arthur Bennett. "Should not be distributed without the lower leaves to show the subcordate character."—J. Gilbert Baker.


Quercus intermedia, D. Don, ñide E. F. Linton. South Harting, Sussex, 8th October, 1892.—M. L. Hodgson. Peduncle too long for intermedia but petiole short; a connecting link between Robur and intermedia."—J. G. Baker. "Surely there is nothing to separate the South Harting Q. intermedia from ordinary pedunculata."—W. Moyle Rogers. The name Q. sessiliflora is undoubtedly antedated by that of Q. femina, Miller, 'Gard. Dict.' Ed. viii. (1768). I should not separate my specimens of the foregoing from Q. Robur, L.—G. C. Druce.

Salix cinerea x phylicifolia, cult. origin, Clova, Forfar; May and July, 1892. Both & and ñ.—W. R. Linton.

S. nigricans, Sm., var. Forsteriana, Sm. Shrewly Pool, June and August, 1891, Warwickshire.—H. Bromwich.

S. nigricans, Sm., var. damascena (Forbes). Shrewly Pool, Warwickshire, June and August, 1891.—H. Bromwich.

S. repens, L. var. prostrata, Sm. Swansea, Glamorgan, 1886.—W. R. Linton.

S. repens v. parvifolia, Sm. Swansea, cult. 1891. The leaves are larger in cultivation. The plant agrees generally with Smith's description.—W. R. Linton.

S. repens v. incubacea, Sm. Holme, Hunts., 1888; and cult. May and August, 1890. No. 13. May I point out the inconsistency of the Club asking in the Desiderata List for the vars. c.e.f. of S. repens, and ignoring them when sent up by treating them as mere variant forms to which no name is worth attaching. The course pursued brings no advance in our knowledge of the repens group, whilst the attempt to number and name the many (not innumerable) forms is justified by the success attending similar work in Hieracia and Rubi.—Wm. R. Linton. "A form only, no variety, a most variable species."—E. S. Marshall. "In putting my pen through the varietal names of some repens (and one nigricans) forms, I do not wish to be taken as meaning that these var. names have not been correctly applied—so far as they are worth anything—by the sender of the specimens. All I mean is that in such polymorphic species the perpetuation of names for varieties is worse than useless—it is a hindrance to study. British willows would have been much better understood long ago if they had not been overloaded with varietal names, in many cases founded on single individual bushes."—F. Buchanan White.
Salix reticulata, L. Ben Lawers, August, 1889.—G. C. Druce.

Stratiotes Aloides, L. Ditch near Abingdon, Berks, July, 1890. This may owe its origin to a pond near Nuneham, Oxon, where it was introduced about 1830. The Abingdon locality is within 2 miles.
—G. C. Druce.

Orchis Simia, Lamk. Oxon, May, 1892.—G. C. Druce.

O. latifolia, L. Midgham, Berks, August, 1892. A tall narrow leaved form.—G. C. Druce.

Ophrys aranifera, Huds. (?) var. fucifera, Sm. Queensdown quarry, Hartley, Kent, May, 1892. I send a dozen specimens selected from about 50 gathered on Queensdown Warren, where it is abundant. As far as comparison is concerned they agree with the specimens of var. fucifera in Herb. Br. Mus., but they differ infinitesimally, if at all, from the type. Both have the labels nearly entire, but the lateral petals in the fresh plants seemed rather more papillose in the selected specimens than in the others. This character is not perceptible in the dried specimens. The tubes are hairy or not, independent of any other observable character.—A. H. Wolley-Dod.

"Seems to be the plant intended by Smith, but the differences are small; I could see no appreciable difference in living Queenston Warren plants and O. aranifera gathered on the Kentish coast."—Arthur Bennett.

O. muscifera, Huds. Wood near Pangbourne, Berks, July, 1892.—G. C. Druce.

Habenaria intacta, Benth. Glanquin, Co. Clare, 20th May, 1892.—H. C. Levinge. A most welcome addition to the herbarium of most of our members.

Gladiolus illyricus, Koch. New Forest, June, 1885.—G. C. Druce.

Leucojum aestivum, L. Lodдон side, Berks, June, 1890.—G. C. Druce.

Polygonatum multiflorum, All. Asbridge wood, Berks, July, 1891.—G. C. Druce.


Asphodelus fistulosus, L. Spread over a considerable surface in two places 400 yards apart; Foss Island, York, Aug., 1889.—J. A. Wheeldon.


J. glaucus, Ehrh. f. Wytham, Berks, July, 1889. A large plant, at a distance suggesting Scirpus Tabernamontani, Gmel., but I cannot see any characters to separate it from J. glaucus beyond its abnormal size.—G. C. Druce.

J. alpinus, Vill. a. genuinus, Buchenau, forma gracilior, teste
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Juncus castaneus, Sm. Ben Laoigh, M. Perth, August, 1889.—G. C. Druce.

J. capitatus, Weigl. Quenvais, Jersey, June, 1877.—G. C. Druce.

Luzula Forsteri, DC. St. John's, Isle of Wight.—G. C. Druce.

L. arcurata, Wahl. Slope of Ben Mc.Dhu, Glen Aan, Banff, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

L. spicata, DC. Aonach Mor, Westerness, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

Acorus Calamus, L. Horton, Northamptonshire, June, 1892. New County Record so far as 'Top. Bot.,' ed. ii., is concerned.—H. D. Geldart. This has been known as a Northamptonshire plant for many years. The late Rev. M. J. Berkeley told me he had gathered it by a pond at Lamport about 1860, and Sir Charles Isham told me it still occurred there about fourteen years ago. I have great doubt of its being indigenous there, or at Horton. It may be native near Peterborough. See my 'Flora of Northamptonshire' in 'Journal of the Northamptonshire Nat. Hist. Soc.,' vol. iv., 1886-7, p. 88.—G. C. Druce.


P. lucens, L., var. acuminatus (Schum.) Mouth of River Inny, L. Deravaragh, co. Westmeath, 9th August, 1892.—H. C. Levinge. "A state, rather than a variety, and these specimens a poor representation of that. Its proper name would seem to be P. lucens, L., var. acuminatus, Fries., ‘Nov. Fl. Suec.,' ed. i. (1816).”—Arthur Bennett.


P. prolongus, Wulf. Iffley, Oxon, June, 1884.—G. C. Druce.

P. perfoliatus, L. Abingdon, Berks, July, 1892.—G. C. Druce.


P. zosteraefolius, Schum. Thames, Sandford, Oxon, July, 1886. Abingdon Canal, Berks, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.


Scirpus Tabernaemontani, Gmel. Marsh ditch, in the Cheddar Valley, North Somerset, 22nd June, 1892. I am not aware that this sedge had been previously seen in N. Somerset.—Jas. W. White. Between Forres and the Culbin Sands, Elgin, August, 1889.—G. C. Druce. "So I think."—Arthur Bennett.

S. maritimus, L. var. compactus, Koch. Southport, August, 1892.—J. A. Wheldon. Also var. compactus, Reichb. Between Leigh and
South end, Essex, July, 1892.—A. H. WOLLEY-DOD, who asks "Is this what is required? or is it merely a young state of the type with which it appears nearly equally common at least locally?" "If Koch named this as above in his 2nd ed. and not in the 1st, then Meyer 'Ch. Hann.', 1836, p. 603, is the authority, but I do not possess Koch's 1st ed."—Arth. Bennett. The earlier name is var. congestus, S. Gray. 'Nat. arr. Br. Pl.,' vol. ii., p. 76, 1821.

Kobresia caricina, Willd. Ben Laoigh, Mid Perth, August, 1889.—G. C. DRUCE.

Carex rupestris, All. Corrie Ceander, S. Aberdeen, August, 1885,—G. C. DRUCE.

C. disticha, Huds., var. longibracteata, Schleich. Marshy meadow, Abingdon, Berks, August, 1892.—G. C. DRUCE.

C. elongata, L. Near Loddon Bridge, Berks, June, 1891.—G. C. DRUCE. A fresh locality.

C. lagopina, Wahl. Corrie Sneachda, Easterness, August, 1891.—G. C. DRUCE.

C. atrata, L. Braeriach, Easterness, August, 1889.—G. C. DRUCE.

C. acuta, L. Abingdon, Berks, July, 1892.—G. C. DRUCE. Also var. gracilescens, Alm. Canal near Abingdon, Berks, July, 1891.—G. C. DRUCE. "A very striking form."—E. S. Marshall. Var. nigrescens, Druce. Marshy meadow, Abingdon, Berks, July, 1892.—G. C. DRUCE. "Seems to be merely a state."—E. S. Marshall. This differs from the type, in having the fruit as well as the glumes of a brownish black colour. It grew (with the other forms) in considerable quantity in a large marshy meadow near Abingdon. It may be only a melanic form.—G. C. Druce. Dr. Lange considers this is only a form.

C. salina, Wahl., var. Kattegatensis (Fries). Beauly River, Easterness, 4th August, 1888.—G. C. DRUCE. Also from same locality, July, 1892.—E. S. MARSHALL.


C. limosa, L. Loch Mallachie, Easterness, July, 1889.—G. C. DRUCE.

C. rariflora, Sm. Table land of Clova, Forfar, August, 1882.—G. C. DRUCE.

C. tomentosa, L. Meadows near Fairford, Gloster E., June, 1892.—G. C. DRUCE. A different locality, but from the same county as those previously sent.

C. panicosa, L. var. Near Holyhead, May, 1892.—J. E. GRIFFITH. "I can only see type in this."—E. S. Marshall. "No variety."—W. R. Linton. "Some of the fruits approach the var. tumidula, while others on the same spike are about normal, and others are like var. conferta—a state, or monstrosity?"—Arthur Bennett. "A form only."—Dr. Lange.


C. binervis, Sm., f. or var. nigrescens, mihi. Ben Eay, West
Ross, Aug., 1889. Some of the specimens closely approach the plant from Corrie Ceander called C. frigida.—G. C. Druce. "A form of binervis."—Dr. Lange.

Carex fulva, Good. Cothill, Berks, July, 1891. This I take to be a hybrid of C. Hornschuchiana with C. flava, but nearer the former species. C. xanthocarpa appears to me nearer the latter. In the 'Students' Flora' I see this latter is said to be a hybrid with C. distans, but I have found it in localities where C. distans is apparently absent.—G. C. Druce. C. xanthocarpa, Déség., Glen Spean, Wester Ross, Aug., 1891.—G. C. Druce.

C. Hornschuchiana, Hoppe. Drinmore, Co. Westmeath, 17th June, 1892.—H. C. Levine. The same form from Fairford, Gloster, E., June, 1892.—G. C. Druce. "About what is called on the continent, but considerable differences are shown in specimens gathered by various collectors in Europe. I have not seen a specimen named by Hoppe."—Arthur Bennett.

C. ——. Sea coast north of Southport, 14th Aug., 1892.—J. A. Wheldon. "Is C. extensa, Good., with the slenderness of var. tenuifolia, DC.; but the spike disposed as in the ordinary form of the plant."—Arthur Bennett.

C. flava, L., var. lepidocarpa, Tausch. ? By Ardbalir Loch, E. Perth, 15th July, 1892. "It appears to fairly fit with Tausch's description. Certainly it is not what we regard as type, nor yet minor, Towns."—E. S. Marshall. Mr. Arthur Bennett thinks it comes nearest to the American var. virens. "I should call Mr. Marshall's Ardbalir Loch Carex 'narrow-leaved flava,' the perigynia and bracts (the most important characters, I suppose) being quite those of the type. I have not, however, seen authentic lepidocarpa, but rely on the paper in 'Journal of Bot.,' 1889, 331, &c. No doubt the Ardbalir plants are greenish, their leaves rather narrow, and their staminate spike long-peduncled; but, to some considerable extent, the colour depends on the age, and, if the character 'sessile or nearly sessile staminate spike' is pressed, the question may arise, 'Have we typical flava in England? I have in my Herb. six sheets in all labelled flava simply (all from the north), and none of them differ materially in this respect, or in the perigynia or bracts at all, from Mr. Marshall's specimens."—W. Moyle Rogers.

C. flava, var. lepidocarpa, Tausch. In the 'Report' for 1891, the Editor remarks that my specimens of this plant from Charnwood Forest "cannot be placed to Tausch's plant," and that he does "not know where to place it at present." Certainly the fruit does not quite correspond with any of the three figures in 'English Botany.' In shape and ribbing it resembles Ederi, but the beak is very much longer and more deflexed. It is smaller than that of flava. Specimens from the same locality have been named lepidocarpa both by the late H. C. Watson, and by Mr. T. R. Archer-Briggs. I send a few more from the same spot, Charnwood Forest, September, 1892.—F. T. Mott. "I think not; stem not scabrous above. A curious plant."—E. S. Marshall. As the Editor of the 1891 'Report' says these are not C. lepidocarpa, Tausch, and are certainly not C.
*Ederi*, auct. ang. = *C. flava*, var. *cypreoides*, Marss. It would probably be called var. *lepidocarpa* by Mr. H. C. Watson and botanists of that era, as until recently Tausch's plant was misunderstood. Although not precisely agreeing with the plant, at present I see no better way than putting these plants to *C. flava*, var. *minor*, Towns., (though it may be var. *Ederi*, Lilj., of which it appears to be a shade grown form); doubtless this name will be found to be antedated. I append a description of *C. lepidocarpa*, Tausch, in 'Flora' 179, 1834. “Spica $\varphi$ solitaria longe exserta, ?? 2,—3 remotis ovatis, infima pedunculata bractea lineari elongata vaginanite suffulta stigmatibus 3, fructibus inflato-tumidis suborbiculatis compressis nervosis rostro 2 dentatis retrorsum dense imbricatis, culmo subfiliformi scabro.”—G. C. Druce.

*Panicum glabrum*, Gaudin. Sandy ground, Telford, Surrey, August, 1892.—E. S. MarshALL.

*Setaria viridis*, Beauv. Didcot, Berks, August, 1892.—G. C. Druce. Casual only.

*S. glauca*, Beauv. Abundant on Foss Island, York, growing with *S. viridis*. August, 1889.—J. A. Wheldon.

*Alopecurus fulvus*, Sm. Near Wokingham, Berks, August, 1892.—G. C. Druce.

*Phleum alpinum*, L. Aonach Mor, Easterness, August, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

*P. pratense*, L., var. *stoloniferum*, Bab. Cromer, Norfolk, 25th July, 1892. This grows mixed with *P. arenarium*, Linn., at the extreme edge of the cliff, smothered in blown sea sand, but it seldom flowers.—H. D. Geldart. “I have not seen Prof. Babington's plant, this may represent it, one cannot determine the colour of anthers in the specimen.”—Arthur Bennett. “Is not a true variety, but depends only on casual conditions of growth. It has no true stolons, but the base of the culm is ascendant and a little creeping.”—E. Hackel.

*Agrostis canina*, L., var. *pallida*. Fish pool, Cheshire; coll. G. A. Holt, July, 1892; comm.—J. H. Steuart. Said to be named by E. Hackel, as was the following.


*A. canina*, L. Bog form with roots and capillary leaves at the lower nodes. See 'Rep. Bot. Ex. Club,' 1884, p. 118. Festiniog, Merioneth, August, 1892.—W. R. Linton. "Var. *mutica*, Döll."—E. Hackel. Apparently one or two plants of *Deschampsia discolor* have been mixed with this, since the Rev. E. F. Linton tells me the sheet sent to him belonged to that species.

Agrostis alba, Linn. A sub-erect form growing on barren sand north-east of Southport, S.W. Lancashire, 27th August, 1892.—CHARLES BAILEY. Is var. coarctata, Koch, teste Hackel.

A. alba, Linn. var. maritima, Mey. Damp flats in the sand-hills between Ainsdale and Birkdale, near Southport, S.W. Lancashire, 1st and 20th August, 1892.—CHARLES BAILEY. "Yes." E. Hackel. "Should not both Mr. Bailey’s forms of A. alba go to var. maritima? Near Beauly, that seemed to me to shade off into coarctata (Hoffman)."
—E. S. Marshall.

A. alba, L. var. gigantea, Meyer. Near Bangor, June, 1892.—J. E. GRIFFITH. Not by any means an extreme form, if indeed it can be called by the above name. Some specimens of Meyer’s variety, which I gathered and distributed, from the Spey side had the appearance at a distance of a species of Calamagrostis, so luxuriant were they.—G. C. Druce.


Polypogon monspeliensis, Desf. St. Sampson’s, Guernsey, June, 1877.—G. D. Druce. Appeared as a casual by rail side at Didcot, Berks, in August, 1892.

Apera interrupta, Beauv. Lakenheath, Suffolk, June, 1885.—G. C. Druce.

Calamagrostis Hookeri, Syme. Damp meadows by Lough Neagh, Armagh, coll. R. L. Praegar, 7th August, 1892. Comm. S. A. STEWART. "Syne described this as Calamagrostis stricta, var. Hookeri in 'English Botany,' where also Armagh is marked as doubtfully producing this plant."—Arthur Bennett.

Deyeuxia neglecta, Kunth, var. borealis = Calamagrostis borealis, Laestad. Strath Tay, Mid Perth, August, 1891. The locality will, I am afraid, soon be destroyed.—G. C. Druce.

Lagurus ovatus, L. South end of St. Ouen’s Bay, Jersey, June, 1877. Sent to correct the record for this as a native plant of Jersey, made in the Dec. number of the ‘Journal of Botany.’ It is scarcely likely that so conspicuous a plant would have been overlooked by M. Piquet, Dr. Bull, and the many botanists who have visited that island. The plants sent as above were gathered in company of a gentleman who told me that he had sowed the seeds (I believe the year preceding my visit) from Guernsey specimens.—G. C. Druce.


Deschampsia alpina, Beauv. Glen Aan, Banff, Aug., 1891.—G. C. Druce.


Arrhenatherum arenaceum, Beauv. On chalk rubble at Oxford, July, 1892. I think distinct from A. bulbosum. I was surprised to find the latter the prevailing plant in wild situations in Glen Spean. About Oxford the former is the common plant, and, although planted in dry chalk rubble, shewed not the least approach to bulbous growth.
Mr. Tufnail tells me in Hort. Sutton the two keep quite distinct.—G. C. Druce.

*Sesleria caerulea*, Scop., var. *flavescens*, Moore. Castle Taylor, county Galway, 16th May, 1892.—H. C. Levinge. "Yes."—E. Hackel. "This form of the plant grows also in Bohemia; and Dr. Moore pointed out certain differences between the Irish and Scotch *Sesleria* (to which his attention had been called by Mr. Mc. Nab) in the 'Phytologist,' vol. 2, p. 130 (1845); but the plant had been named by Opiz. and Knaf., and is *S. caerulea*, Arduin, var. *luteoalba*, Opiz., Böh. Gew.‘ p. 14, 1823. *S. caerulea*, var. flor. *luteoalba*" Knaf. in litt.” ex Bertch and Seidls' 'Fl. Böh.', p. 492, 1836."—Arthur Bennett.


*Dactylis glomerata*, L., var. Freshwater Cliffs, Isle of Wight, July, 1892. Growing with *Serrafalcus Ferronii*, Mabille, which it imitates in habit. Is it var. *abbreviata*, Bernh.?—A. H. Wolley-Dod. I have the same plant from the locality given, collected by Miss C. E. Palmer three or four years back, when I referred it to var. *abbreviata*.—G. C. Druce. Prof. E. Hackel says "yes, var. *abbreviata*, Bernh."

*Poa alpina*, L. A curious caespitose form which is, I believe, varietally distinct from *P. alpina*, occurs on the steep cliffs of Aonach Mor, Westerness, August, 1891. Prof. Hackel simply labelled them *P. alpina*. The type is sent from Ben Lawers.—G. C. Druce. "It looks very interesting."—E. S. Marshall. I have again called Professor Hackel's attention to it, but he says it is only a dwarf form of *P. alpina*. The panicle is depauperate, but he does not yet decide whether it is a variety or state. The Loch-na-gar specimens of so called *P. laxa* he refers without doubt to *P. alpina*. Have we the *P. laxa* in Britain? I doubt.—G. C. Druce.


*P. nemoralis*, L. Near Cold Ash Common, July, 1891.—G. C. Druce. This plant, which is referred to the type by Prof. Hackel, differs from our common Berkshire plant by its more spreading panicle.

*P. compressa*, L. Wytham, Berks, July, 1892.—G. C. Druce.


*F. rubra*, L. Type, on chalk rubble, brought from Berkshire to Oxford Railway Station. Plant rather gone over. July, 1891.—G. C. Druce. Named by Prof. Hackel.

*F. ——*. Sandy banks by the sea, Wallasey, Cheshire, August, 1892.—J. A. Wheldon. "*oraria*, Dum., which is a var. of *F. rubra*." J. Gilbert Baker. "Clearly a form of *F. rubra*. I think Herr Hackel would put it under *genuina*, but root-material is not sufficient in the specimens sent to me."—E. S. Marshall. "*F. rubra*

*Festuca arundinacea*, Schreb. Rail side by Portmeadow, Oxford, July, 1892.—G. C. DRUCE.

*Bromus tectorum*, L. Casual. Rubbish heap, Botley, Oxon, July and August, 1891. Casual.—G. C. DRUCE.

*B. erectus*, Huds. Abingdon, Berks, July, 1892. The specimen determined by Hudson himself from Pulteney's Herbarium is hairy, *i.e.*, the var. *pubescens*, Gray = *villosus*, Syme, which will thus stand as the type with a var. *glabrescent*, mihi. The Berks specimen is glabrescent, *i.e.*, var. *glabrescens*.—G. C. DRUCE.

*B. commutatus*, Schrad. Wytham, Berks, July, 1892.—G. C. DRUCE. Prof. E. Hackel kindly gives a distinction by which this and *B. secalinus* can be distinguished when they are in a flowering state. *B. commutatus*—upper pales shorter than the inferior. *B. secalinus*—upper pales longer than the inferior.

*B. mollis*, L., var. Border of cornfield, Freshwater Gate, Isle of Wight, 13th July, 1892. A perfectly prostrate plant, though the surrounding vegetation was tall and luxuriant. There was nothing to account for its state except that it was within a hundred yards of the edge of the cliff. It looks like large *Serrafalis Ferronii*, Mabille.—A. H. WOLLEY-DOD. "*B. mollis*, var. *conglomeratus*, Pers."—E. Hackel. The name *B. hordeaceus*, L., of ed. i. *Sp. Pl.*, was changed by Linnaeus in ed. ii. to *B. mollis*, L., as pointed out by Prof. Hackel, but he does not approve of altering the existing nomenclature.—G. C. DRUCE.

*B. arvensis*, L. Railside, Didcot, Berks, July and August, 1892. New County Record. Introduced probably with hay for the horses employed by G. W. R., as a number of plants often of S. European origin are found from time to time in the vicinity. The *Bromus arvensis*, however, is abundant, and extends along the line to Oxford where our herbarium assistant, Baker, found it in the preceding June.—G. C. DRUCE.


*Agropyron pungens*, R. & S. var. *littorale* (Reichb.). Lowestoft, Suffolk, 14th July, 1892.—H. D. GELDART.

*A. repens*, Beauv. var. *barbatum* (Duval Jouve). Beauty, Easterness, August, 1889.—G. C. DRUCE.

*Hordeum jubatum*, L. Crossness, near Erith, Kent, 3rd July, 1892. A North American species found occasionally in this locality, but scarcely naturalized, I think. I send it in case any member may care to have it, if only on account of its beauty.—A. H. WOLLEY-DOD. "Yes."—E. Hackel. A few plants occurred by rail side at Oxford.

—G. C. DRUCE.

*Ceterach officinarum*, Willd., var. *crenatum*, Milde. Near Ballyvaughan, Clare, 19th May, 1892.—H. C. LEVINGE.

*Cystopteris montana*, Bernh. Ben Laoigh, Argyle, August, 1889. —G. C. DRUCE.
Lastraea spinulosa, Presl., b. exaltatum. Woods, Foxes' Bridge, Forest of Dean, W. Gloucestershire, August, 1892.—AUGUSTIN LEY. “Typical spinulosa.”—J. G. BAKER.

L. spinulosa, Presl. c. decipiens. Near Tintern, Monmouthshire, 14th September, 1892. One large clump of this plant was observed. It appears to me to agree in every particular with the description of the var. decipiens of L. spinulosa in ‘Eng. Bot.’ Ed. iii.—AUGUSTIN LEY.

L. spinulosa, var. c. decipiens, Syme. Near Tintern, Monmouthshire, 14th September, 1892.—W. A. SHOOLBRED. “I should have called this typical spinulosa; decipiens is a glandular form.”—J. Gilbert Baker. “Seems to accord with Syme’s description, except that I cannot find the indusia obviously dentate.”—Arthur Bennett.

L. spinulosa, Presl., d. glandulosa. Damp wood, Foxes’ Bridge, Forest of Dean, West Gloster, 4th August, 1892. If rightly named, an interesting rediscovery of this fern in the Forest of Dean. The original locality, “Ankerbury bog,” near Lydbrook, where the plant has long been extinct, lies about four miles distant from Foxes’ Bridge. Three or four large rootstocks were observed among abundance of L. spinulosa, var. exaltatum, and sparing L. dilatata, Presl. Rootstocks slightly creeping, but not so much so as in L. spinulosa, var. exaltatum.—AUGUSTIN LEY. “This is what I understand is L. spinulosa, var. decipiens, Syme.”—J. Gilbert Baker. Mr. Ley rightly labels his plant from the ‘Lond. Cat.,’ but its being placed under spinulosa there must, I think, have been an error. The consensus of opinion (H. C. Watson, Newman, Moore, &c.) places it under dilatata. In so difficult a plant, it ill becomes me to say more than that Mr. Ley’s specimen does not well agree with an original specimen of Mr. Doubleday’s (Essex) I possess. Mr. Ley’s plant is not nearly so glandular, the scales in his plant are more pointed, the pinnæ do not seem to present that peculiar upward turn that glandulosa seems to. With an ordinary lens, I cannot detect any conspicuous glands on the indusia of Mr. Ley’s specimen, while Mr. Doubleday’s shows them very numerous, and, although the outline of the indusia in Mr. Ley’s plant is serrated, still I can find no stalked glands on the serrations as in glandulosa. Mr. Newman has been quoted as considering the plant as a species; but, in the ‘Phytologist,’ 1851, p. xv., he distinctly repudiates this idea. On the whole, I should find it difficult to label Mr. Ley’s specimens as glandulosa.”—Arthur Bennett.

Polypodium vulgare,. L. var. serratum, Willd. Knock Ross, Co. Westmeath, 17th June, 1892.—H. C. LEVINGE.

Equisetum limosum, L. var. polystachion, A. F. BRÜCK. ‘Fl. Neob. Prod.’ (1803) p. 63. Marsh, near the Caledonian Canal, Westerness, Aug., 1891. Necessarily this form belongs to E. fluviatile, L. It is a state rather than a true variety, but one which I have not previously seen in Britain. The swamp in which it grew was being drained and this diminished moisture may have caused it to assume this form, but the almost daily rain of that wet summer does not support the argument strongly.—G. C. DRRCE.

E. MOORE, Newman. Three Castle Head, Co. Wicklow, 3rd


Tolyphila glomerata, Leonh. Marcham, Berks, July, 1891.—G. C. Druce.

T. intricata, Leonh. Marston, Oxon, September, 1888.—G. C. Druce.


N. gracilis, Agardh. I learn from Messrs. Groves that the plant I sent to the Club under above name in 1890 and 1891 is a “large loose form of N. Nordstedtiana, Groves.” It is described and figured in the ‘Journal of Botany,’ 1890, p. 65. The label will therefore need correction.—R. W. Scully.

N. mucronata, Kütz. ‘Phyc. Germ.,’ 256. Ditch near Godstow Nunnery, Oxford, Aug., 1892. A most interesting addition to our aquatic flora made while showing the Extension Students the Aristolochia at Godstow. It occurred plentifully in the adjoining ditch and continued there till the winter. A few specimens are still to be seen. I could not find it in the river which feeds the ditch. But in another ditch northwards in Berks, a few small specimens were seen. New County Records for Berks and Oxon.—G. C. Druce.

CORRECTIONS OF THE 1891 ‘REPORT.’

Cardamine flexuosa × pratensis, p. 324. There can be no doubt that the plant sent up is the hybrid. It was seen growing by Messrs. Murray, E. F. Linton, and myself, and pronounced to be exactly intermediate. Mr. E. F. Linton took a root and grew it, which has since flowered and proved sterile. Moreover, the question I asked was not whether it was this hybrid, but whether this hybrid is the same as the v. Hayneana, Welw.—Wm. R. Linton.

Rubus Leesii, Bab., p. 326. This was already recorded for the County in the 1890 ‘Report,’ p. 230.—Wm. R. Linton.

R. sp. Hulland Wood, p. 326, read Ward vice Wood; and R. sp. Atlow, August 2nd should be August 11th. I sent a note early in 1892 to the Editor giving the reference to the description of these Rubi in ‘Jour. of Bot.’ where they were named durescens.—Wm. R. Linton.

Hieracium sparsifolium, Lindeb., p. 340. This plant turns out in cultivation to be as here named.—Wm. R. Linton.

May I suggest that the four Hieracia mentioned on p. 2 of Desiderata list as not required, are nearly all required as wild plants,
e.g., *diaphanum* was scheduled no doubt because of a quantity of rather doubtful material sent by myself and Mr. Charles Bailey (from a locality where I have since gathered the true plant). Also *Rubus Lintoni* was placed on the same list because Mr. Ley sent a quantity of material, which he is now going to describe under another name. *Arenaria ciliata* also should not have been excluded. We most of us want more.—E. F. LINTON.

On p. 15, Desid. list, *Hierac. angustatum, H. holophyllum* and *H. submurorum* are wrongly inserted, being already given at 849A, 860A and 861A. *H. subanfractum*, Marsh, should be *H. anfractiforme*, E. S. Marshall.—W. R. LINTON. Mr. Marshall first named this latter plant *Hieracium anfractiforme*, but it was pointed out that there was a *H. silvaticum × anfractiforme*, so later on in the ‘Journ. Bot.,’ p. 188, 1892, he wished to withdraw the name and substitute *H. subanfractum*. This is, however, not quite necessary according to leges. nom. That is, if by the above citation *H. silvaticum*, var. *anfractiforme*, Alm., is intended. If Almquist meant his plant to be a species *H. anfractiforme*, Mr. Marshall’s original name must sink and his later one be adopted.—G. C. DRUCE.