Penstemon Fendleri and *Pericome glandulosa*. *G. Wrightii* has been previously known from the adjoining state of New Mexico.

LIATRIS PUNCTATA Hook., var. **coloradensis** (Gaiser), stat. nov., (*L. punctata* Hook., var. *typica* Gaiser, forma *coloradensis* Gaiser, RHODORA **48:** 351. 1946).

In the western part of the Oklahoma Panhandle, where it is common, *L. punctata* has the purple, mucronate involucre bracts as described in Gaiser's forma *coloradensis*. I have not found var. *typica* present in this area. Thus var. *coloradensis* seems to be distinct geographically in at least a part of its range from var. *typica*.

*VERNONIA BALDWINII Torr., var. INTERIOR (Small) Schub., forma **alba,** f. nov., corrollis albidis. TYPE: *Waterfall* 8472, edge of Clear Lake, 3 miles south and 2 west of Tom, McCurtian County, August 7, 1948. The *type* is in the Bebb Herbarium of the University of Oklahoma.

DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY AND PLANT PATHOLOGY,
OKLAHOMA A. & M. COLLEGE,
Stillwater, Oklahoma.

NEED FOR CAUTION REGARDING CERTAIN COLLECTIONS

M. L. FERNALD

ONE of the greatest sources of confusion regarding the detailed or the broad ranges of plants is the lack of appreciation in the past, and sometimes in present times, of the sacredness of original data and the danger in labels not coming directly from the collector. The misinformation through which Linnaeus named plants, indigenous only in eastern North America, *Athamanta chinensis* (this becoming *Conioselinum chinense* (L.) BSP.) and *Hydrocotyle chinense* (the coastal *Lilaeopsis chinensis* (L.) Ktze.) is repeated for various plants with other wholly inappropriate or misleading names. Similarly, Michaux too often had on his labels geographic data strikingly contradicting the published statement or, as in the case of his *Angelica triquinata*, evidently written from memory or through confusion of geographic names. His *Angelica triquinata*, "*Hab.* in Canada", is a good example.

The photograph of his type cannot be matched with anything Canadian but, as shown in Rhodora, xlv. 298–300, plates 768 and 769 (1943), it was the plant described fifty years later as *A. Curtisii* Buckley, from North Carolina. By clerical error, apparently, Canada had been written instead of Carolina.

Such errors were too frequent in Linnaean and early post-Linnaean days and in the organizing of collections from somewhat unfamiliar territory, which were handled by others than the original collectors or which were loose in sheets and not mounted and organized until after the collector's death (as in case of Michaux's material); but an even more confusing practice was one which prevailed a century or so ago. Field-explorers, visiting new regions, collected plants new to their experience from several localities each, giving them field-numbers or otherwise (by locality, date, etc.) indicating them as seemingly different. These vast collections, brought or sent back to the sponsoring institutions, whether in Europe or America, were "lumped" by those who lacked the field-appreciation of them, and material from utterly different localities was distributed as all coming from a single station. Such confusions, with wholly different collections represented in the older herbaria as if one, and with the exact localities lost, are tantalizingly numerous and have led and still lead to many misinterpretations. These are short-sighted practices of the past, with misinterpretations which will always continue unless some future enthusiast has the time and necessary funds to visit all the leading herbaria of the period and properly to identify the confused elements and the wholly inconsistent paratypes.

My immediate purpose in this note, however, is not to expand on that familiar source of confusion, but to call attention to a large collection of plants of New England and New York which had similar treatment and which, distributed broadcast as duplicates, is bound to cause confusion. Rev. Joseph Blake (1814–1888) was an enthusiastic amateur botanist who at various times had pastorates at different towns in Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and New York. At all these centers he collected assiduously and in great duplication. At his death his vast herbarium went to the Maine State College (now the University of Maine), where it was organized and overhauled by an instruc-

tor of keen enthusiasm. Being a young beginner in botany, I spent all time out of school-hours watching the process which was very simple: a specimen of each collection, with Blake's label, was set aside for preservation; then all duplicates of any number of collections supposed to be of one species were dumped into one cover, some one of the diverse labels copied and eventually all the duplicates, whether from Harrison (Maine), Wells (Maine), Gilmanton (New Hampshire), Willoughby or Smuggler's Notch (Vermont), Andover (Massachusetts), somewhere in New York or some other region, were distributed to other herbaria. The authenticity of data (and identity of plant) on labels of the duplicates, collected by Blake, is to be mistrusted and, if accepted, will often lead to error.

Another perpetual source of error is the label which emphasizes the home-address of the collector rather than the locality for the plant. George Engelmann had such a label and too often he forgot to give the locality for the specimen sent out, so that one has to be on guard. Allied to this source of error are the cases where two or more names of collectors appear on a label, but in which the collector's data has been carelessly forgotten, so that identical material is distributed by no. 1 as from one region but by no. 2 as from another (often in a state whence the plant is really unknown).

Similar sources of error might be enumerated but only two others, these seriously concerning records from Maine, will be here noted. Kate Furbish was an enthusuastic painter of the flowering plants of Maine and her wonderfully accurate illustrations (life-size) are invaluable. She kept no organized herbarium, but had many loosely tied newspaper-packages of pressed plants massed into a few deep mounds, with scores of species in one fold of paper. The packages had somewhere a memorandum "Fort Kent plants, 1880", or "Wells" or other locality and often the date. In November, 1908, when she was approaching her 75th birthday, Miss Furbish shipped to the New England Botanical Club her vast accumulation of loose material. As the then functioning Curator, I sorted the material and, with the aid of students, innocently (and, we supposed, helpfully) had labels made. One of them on a poor bit of *Rhexia virginica* bears the data "Fort Kent, Maine, July, 1880".

Now, so far as we actually know, *Rhexia* reaches its northern limit in central Maine in the acid peaty borders of Chimo Pond in Bradley, Penobscot County, about 150 miles south of the calcareous region of Fort Kent. At any rate, in 1891, while spending her summer at Orono, hearing that *Rhexia,* which she had "always wanted to see", occurred at Chimo, she was taken there by the late Fred P. Briggs. Briggs's account of her excitement on first seeing it was amusing. Jumping up in the boat and nearly capsizing it, she delightedly shouted: "Goody! goody! *Rhexia!* No wonder they call it the king of the flowers"; but that does not prove that she had unknowingly found it eleven years earlier at Fort Kent! One other of the products from Miss Furbish's packages came from a bundle marked "West Baldwin, September 10, 1900". This is a bit of *Cardamine bellidifolia,* definitely known in Maine only from alpine areas of Mt. Katahdin. Nevertheless, there is the label, reading: "Crevices of granite rocks in bed of mountain stream, West Baldwin, Sept. 10, 1900". The solution is as follows. Miss Furbish spent the summer of 1900 at West Baldwin in the Saco Valley, a region of low forested hills, without anything suggesting alpine conditions. Coming out from Mt. Katahdin in mid-July, 1900, I carefully packed in wet moss fresh plants, including the Cardamine, of species which I thought would be new to her, and sent them to West Baldwin. *Cardamine bellidifolia* was eventually tucked in with other plants collected or received by her at West Baldwin. Regretting to record such unintentional errors by one whom everyone admired and greatly respected, the facts are important as clarifying the situation, for she did not realize that the notes on her packages would be taken too literally.

One other case which concerns Maine records is that of a collection of identified plants passed in at the end of the spring-term at Orono, as collected at Shapleigh, York County, Maine. The student handing in the series could pray or exhort for half-an-hour at a stretch at Y. M. C. A. or Christian Endeavor meetings and during the spring-term had returned home on account of illness. The collection from "Shapleigh" was remarkable in containing several calcicolous species never before known from Maine. Somewhat later, the Josselyn Botanical Society of Maine went to the acid region of Shapleigh and hunted in vain

for them. When he was written to and asked to make known the stations, his reply was, that before transferring to Maine State he had spent a year at Massachusetts State College at Amherst, and that it was possible that some of the Amherst plants had got mixed in. He certainly needed to pray.

The upshot is, obviously, that great care must be exercised in accepting data from those who do not realize its importance, and that all of us should see that our own statements on labels are quite accurate. Gradually we learn that even the complimentary placing of names on the label of non-botanical members of a party or those who have had no part in the collecting may become embarrassing. Enough said!

SYNONYMY IN VIBURNUM OBOVATUM AND V. CASSINOIDES

WILBUR H. DUNCAN

A specimen labeled *Viburnum corymbosum* (Miller) Rehder was among a set of exchange plants recently received at the University of Georgia Herbarium. The specimen is obviously *V. obovatum* Walter, a species found in the Coastal Plain from Florida to Virginia, an area containing no closely similar relatives. I wondered about the status of the former name and attempted to find it in publications at my immediate disposal. It is neither listed in the Index Kewensis (including 9 supplements) nor included in Rehder (Manual of Cult. Trees & Shrubs: 1940; and Bibliography of Cult. Trees & Shrubs: 1949), Bailey (Manual of Cultivated Plants. Rev.: 1949), Robinson and Fernald (Gray's New Manual of Botany, Ed. 7.: 1908), Small (Flora of S. E. States: 1933), and other manuals. Shortly after these preliminary efforts I visited the Gray Herbarium and continued the search for published matter connected with the name. The Gray Card Index includes no reference to the *V. corymbosum* above but does cite *Viburnum corymbosum* Urb. (Fedde. Rep. Spec. Nov. **18:** 121, published 15 August, 1922) which is found in Cuba and differs considerably from the material in question.

Rehder's interpretation of the synonymy was eventually found as a footnote in Journal Arnold Arb. **3:** 214. 28 December, 1922. *V. corymbosum* (Miller) Rehder is, therefore, a later homonym