

TORREYA

July, 1910

Vol. 10

No. 7

LOCAL FLORA NOTES—IV

BY NORMAN TAYLOR

LILIACEAE

LIBRARY
NEW YORK
BOTANICAL
GARDEN

1. *Hemerocallis flava* L. This plant has been cultivated so commonly in our gardens that it is likely to become established at any time. Is it known to grow where it could be considered as unquestionably established?

2. *Allium carinatum* L. In the appendix to Britton's manual this plant is given as a naturalized plant in Bucks Co., Pa. Is it naturalized elsewhere? There are no specimens from the local flora range.*

3. *Allium canadense* L. The only stations represented in the collections are Crosswicks Creek, N. J., and two points on Staten Island. This common meadow garlic has a general range of Maine to Florida. The inference is unmistakable.

4. *Lilium Philadelphicum* L. There are a great many specimens in the collection. Curiously enough they all represent localities north of the terminal moraine. Whether this restriction is only accidental or whether it actually exists is entirely conjectural. Has anyone seen this plant south of the moraine? What is its distribution on Staten Island and Long Island? There are no specimens from either island.

5. *Lilium canadense* L. What has been said of *L. Philadelphicum* applies equally to this species. Apparently the restriction is not generic for *L. superbum* L. is found in New Jersey well to the southward of the moraine.

* The local flora range as prescribed by the Club's preliminary catalog of 1888 is as follows: All the state of Connecticut; Long Island; in New York the counties bordering the Hudson River up to and including Columbia and Greene, also Sullivan and Delaware counties; all the state of New Jersey; and Pike, Wayne, Monroe, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Northampton, Lehigh, Carbon, Bucks, Berks, Schuylkill, Montgomery, Philadelphia, Delaware, and Chester counties in Pennsylvania.

[No. 6, Vol. 10, of TORREYA, comprising pages 125-144, was issued July 1, 1910]

6. *Erythronium albidum* Nutt. The general range of this species is given as "Ont. to Minn., south to Ga.", etc. There are no specimens from our range, the nearest stations represented in the collection, being Albany, N. Y., and Alleghany Co., Pa. In Britton's catalog of New Jersey plants the species is doubtfully credited to the state. What is the distribution of the plant in our range?

7. *Erythronium propullans* A. Gray. The inclusion of this plant in these notes is probably quite useless. In Britton's manual the species is reported from New York. No specimens are extant from the range and the plant's general distribution almost precludes the idea of its occurrence. It may turn up in the higher Catskills.

8. *Aletris aurea* Walt. The plant is reported from southern New Jersey, according to Gray and Rusby. Apparently the report is not true, for at least some of the specimens on which it was based are *A. farinosa*. Has anyone ever seen it in southern Jersey? Otherwise its most northerly station is in Virginia.

CONVALLARIACEAE

1. *Clintonia umbellulata* (Michx.) Torrey. A single rather doubtful specimen from Short Hills, N. J., is all that was found in the combined collections. While the plant may be rare it seems scarcely credible that we know its true range. The general range is given as "N. Y. and N. J. to Ga.", etc.

2. *Vagnera racemosa* (L.) Morong. The only excuse for mentioning this common plant is that in spite of general statements that the plant is common throughout New Jersey, none of our specimens are from south of New Brunswick. Among the twenty-odd stations represented it is curious that this plant should be so restricted to the upper part of the pine land region. Elsewhere in the range it is very common.

3. *Vagnera trifolia* (L.) Morong. One specimen marked merely "Conn." is all we have from the range. With a general range of from Newfoundland to New Jersey and Pennsylvania it should be found in northern New Jersey, the hilly part of the counties in Pennsylvania, and almost certainly in the Catskills. Judging

from extra-territorial specimens in the collections the plant marked merely "Conn." came from the northern part of the state.

4. *Streptopus amplexifolius* (L.) DC. The only two stations represented by our specimens are in the higher Catskills. Presumably the species is found along the mountains south to North Carolina, but just how far down within our range it may be found is entirely unknown except by inference.

5. *Trillium erectum* L. Among the twenty or more stations represented there is only one on Long Island, at Glen Cove. Has this plant ever been seen south of the hilly back-bone of the island? In New Jersey the statement that it is found only in the middle or upper counties is quite correct, so far as our specimens show. Has the plant been collected south of a line extending from Perth Amboy to Belvidere, N. J.?

6. *Trillium undulatum* Willd. The most southerly station in our range is apparently the Pocono Plateau, Pa. With a general distribution reaching to Georgia on the south this plant can probably be found considerably further south than the Pocono region.

7. *Trillium grandiflorum* (Michx.) Salisb. There are no specimens from the range. The nearest locality to our area is Lancaster Co., Pa. The general distribution of this species postulates a wider range for it within our area than is evidenced by reports and specimens.

SMILACACEAE

1. *Smilax tamnifolia* Michx. Some specimens from southern Jersey show the plant's distribution in this region to be about as the manuals indicate. Neither of them says anything about the occurrence of this species on Long Island. An unquestionably authentic specimen from Rockville Centre, L. I., collected by Mr. E. P. Bicknell, gives rise to the query as to where else the plant may be found. There is a strong probability that the species will ultimately turn up in the intervening territory, particularly that which is of similar geologic structure.

2. *Smilax pulverulenta* Michx. With a general distribution of "Ontario to N. Carolina", etc., our single specimen from Bartow, New York City, quite obviously does not hint at the

plant's distribution in the range. It is doubtless common but specimens are desired to permanently record its true distributional status.

3. *Smilax Pseudo-China* L. In a footnote to page 239 of Britton's catalogue of New Jersey plants we read "... admitted into the Preliminary catalogue on the authority of Gray's manual, . . . not definitely known to me from the state." Dr. Britton's manual credits the species with a range from Maryland southward, but says nothing about any Jersey stations. The new Gray manual still credits the plant to southern New Jersey, but to offset this there is complete neglect of the species in the carefully compiled catalog of the plants of Philadelphia and vicinity. Has the plant ever been found growing in southern Jersey?

4. *Smilax hispida* Muhl. Although this species is supposed to grow "from Ontario to Va.," etc., our most northerly station is Andover, Sussex Co., N. J. Its distribution in the upper counties of Pennsylvania and in New York state above the Jersey state line is completely unknown.

5. *Smilax Bona-nox* L. Both manuals give New Jersey as a state in which this plant grows. The combined collections here do not show the plant as coming north of Virginia. The Philadelphia catalog excludes the plant from New Jersey but credits it to Delaware. If the station at Nantucket is correct,* the apparent lack of the plant between Maryland and Massachusetts is curious. If, on the other hand, the Massachusetts station should prove to be invalid we have still to account for the plant's distribution in south Jersey and adjacent Pennsylvania.

6. *Smilax laurifolia* L. The only two specimens from the range are both from stations just to the westward of Barnegat, N. J. The general distribution of "southern New Jersey" includes more territory than the specimens in our collections represent. A northern extension of the range may be looked for.

7. *Smilax Walteri* Pursh. There is a very meager representa-

* E. P. Bicknell in his serial flora of Nantucket, now appearing in the bulletin of the Torrey Club, says that the occurrence of this plant in Massachusetts is doubtful, and excludes it from the island, the only recorded occurrence of it in that state.

tion of this species in the collection, the only definite locality recorded being May's Landing, N. J. It should occur commonly in the pine-barren regions of the state.

NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN

REVIEWS

Greene's Landmarks of Botanical History*

Julius von Sachs' well-known history of botany from the sixteenth century to the year 1860 is confessedly brief in its treatment of the beginnings of botanical science. Furthermore, it was written as a volume of a series on the history of the sciences in Germany and is somewhat predominantly German in its outlook, even though it must be admitted that the modern developments of the science of botany have, in a large measure, been fostered on German soil. And, again, this work, like its recent continuation by Professor J. Reynolds Green (1909), was written by a botanist who was primarily a physiologist, and the physiological aspects of the science are the ones that receive the most adequate treatment. The historical works of Sprengel (1807-'08) and of Meyer (1854-'57) do more justice to the very interesting beginnings of botanical literature, but they were never translated and are less well known to English and American readers.

This first instalment of Doctor Edward Lee Greene's "Landmarks," covering the period prior to the year 1562, will therefore prove most welcome to the many botanists, both amateur and professional, who have been awaiting a readable scholarly account of the earlier phases of the development of their science. A reader equipped with a certain amount of knowledge of the morphology of plants and with a certain degree of personal familiarity with plants in the field and garden is likely to find Dr. Greene's elegantly phrased paragraphs so interesting and illuminating that the book, once opened, will hardly find its way to the shelves until it has been read through.

*Greene, Edward Lee. *Landmarks of Botanical History. A Study of Certain Epochs in the Development of the Science of Botany. Part I—Prior to 1562 A. D.* Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, part of volume 54. Pp. 1-329. 1909.



Taylor, Norman. 1910. "LOCAL FLORA NOTES—IV." *Torreyana* 10(7), 145–149.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/100239>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/348438>

Holding Institution

New York Botanical Garden, LuEsther T. Mertz Library

Sponsored by

The LuEsther T Mertz Library, the New York Botanical Garden

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Public domain. The BHL considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection.

Rights: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions/>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.