

- Culms loosely cespitose, the rhizome elongate; perigynia scarcely beaked. *C. pertenuis*.
 Culms densely cespitose from a short rootstock; perigynia definitely beaked.
 Principal leaf-blades 2-4 mm. wide, channeled above and more or less keeled below, sparsely short-hirsute; perigynium oblong-obovoid, the beak ciliate-serrulate. *C. viridiflora*.
 Principal leaf-blades 3.5-5.5 mm. wide, flat, glabrous; perigynium-beak smooth.
 Sheaths hispidulous; spikes 8-12 cm. long; perigynia spindle-shaped, glabrous, with beak 1.5 mm. long. *C. perlonga*.
 Sheaths smooth; spikes 3-5 cm. long; perigynia ellipsoid, sparsely puberulent, the beak 0.5-0.75 mm. long. *C. Mackenziana*.

It is surely appropriate to dedicate to the late Mr. Mackenzie a well-marked species in the genus with which he worked so long and to the understanding of which he added so much.

6. NOTES ON NOMENCLATURE IN IRIDACEAE

BY ROBERT C. FOSTER

THESE notes embody a number of nomenclatural changes in *Iridaceae*, changes, for the most part, made necessary either by the priority rule or by the rule concerning later homonyms within a genus. A rigid application of this latter rule will, perforce, result in many alterations of specific names. Where the earlier name belongs to a plant which is a valid species, there seems no legitimate objection to changing the later name. On the other hand, where the earlier homonym is recognized as a synonym, it seems unfortunate that the later-named plant must be renamed, or that the use of the specific name is barred within a genus. For example, in 1787 Thunberg transferred *Ferraria undulata* L. to *Moraea*, a change which has been unacceptable to later workers. Yet, this brief and incorrect sojourn in *Moraea* will, under the present rules, prevent the use of the specific name *undulata* for any species of *Moraea*.

By no means all the errors discovered are considered here. It has not yet been possible to investigate some as fully as is necessary. In other cases, taxonomic study seems desirable before changing names. A hasty survey of *Gladiolus* showed the presence of nearly fifty later homonyms in that genus. They are not treated here, since the genus is being monographed by Mrs. Louisa Bolus. In so large and difficult a group it seems especially preferable to make nomenclatural changes only after taxonomic study. Finally, since taxonomic studies have not been possible, changes in status have been avoided in the present work.

For friendly criticism and assistance during the course of this work, I am particularly indebted to Professor M. L. Fernald, Mr. C. A. Weatherby, and Miss Marjorie W. Stone of the Gray Herbarium.

1. HELIXYRA

The late N. E. Brown, in 1929, revived and characterized the genus *Helixyra* of Salisbury, making eight new combinations and describing four new species, Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 348-350. When Salisbury erected the genus *Helixyra*, in Trans. Hort. Soc. Lond. i. 305 (1812), he placed in it only one species, *H. flava* Salisb. Neither genus nor species was described, but the latter was merely a new name given to the plant which Ker had previously described as *Moraea longiflora*, Bot. Mag. t. 712 (1804), this name being cited as a synonym of *H. flava*. The change in specific name was, of course, unwarranted. In addition, *M. longiflora* Ker was published without the generic characterization usually provided for these plates. In its place, reference was made to three earlier figures of *Moraea* in the Botanical Magazine, namely, *M. flexuosa* Linn. f., t. 695 (1803), *M. edulis* (Linn. f.) Ker, t. 613 (1803), and *M. unguiculata* Ker, t. 593 (1802). Of these, only the last-named plate contained a generic characterization of *Moraea* Mill., at least as Ker understood that genus, in part. Under the circumstances it seems impossible to argue that *Helixyra* was validly published by reference to a "previously and effectively published description of the genus under another name," Internat. Rules Bot. Nomencl. (ed. 3), Art. 42 (2). If such a position should be maintained, however, *Helixyra* still remains invalid. In giving the generic character for *M. unguiculata*, Ker specifically made the genus *Vieusseuxia* of De la Roche, Descr. Pl. Nov. 31 (1766), synonymous with it and its immediate relatives. A generic character applicable to *M. unguiculata*, whether *Vieusseuxia* be regarded as a separate genus or as a subgenus of *Moraea*, cannot also be applicable to *M. longiflora* and used to validate *Helixyra*. For, as Salisbury correctly recognized, *M. longiflora* is generically distinct from *Moraea*. Since *M. unguiculata* and *M. longiflora* are not congeneric, we have here the reverse of the situation mentioned, not the same genus under another name, but a different genus under the same name. Because of this generic distinction, too, the third portion of Article 42 cannot be used to validate *Helixyra*. Finally, since, Salisbury was not describing a new species, it does not seem possible to use Article 43 to validate the name.

For over a century, until 1929 apparently, the name *Helixyra* has

been used for a subgenus of *Moraea*, containing, among other species, *M. longiflora* Ker. This has been done by Baker in Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xvi. 132 (1877), Handbk. Irid. 48, 57-58 (1892), and Flor. Cap. vi. 10 (1896), Bentham and Hooker, Gen. Pl. iii. 689 (1883), Pax in Engler and Prantl, Pflzfam. ii (5). 146 (1888), and Diels in Engler and Prantl, Pflzfam. (ed. 2) xva. 500 (1930). It should be noted that Baker in 1877 included *Moraea Sisyrinchium* (L.) Ker in this subgenus, making *Gynandriris* of Parlatores, Nuov. Gen. e Spec. Monocot. 49 (1854), synonymous with *Helixyra*, although in 1892 he treated *Gynandriris* as a portion of the genus *Iris*. Restoring generic rank to *Helixyra*, N. E. Brown (1929, l. c.), like Baker, made *Gynandriris* Parl. synonymous with *Helixyra*, after giving a detailed description of the latter genus for the first time in its history, thus making it *Helixyra* Salisb. ex N. E. Brown.

On the score of nomenclature, Brown's treatment of *Helixyra* seems open to some criticism. In Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xlviii. 39 (1928), he used the name without characterization of the genus in making a new combination, *Helixyra setifolia* (Linn. f.) N. E. Br., a thing which he rectified in the following year by including *H. setifolia* (Linn. f.) N. E. Br. in his treatment of the genus. In this treatment, incidentally, he included the plant known variously as *Iris Sisyrinchium* L. or *Moraea Sisyrinchium* (L.) Ker, making the new combination, *H. Sisyrinchium* (L.) N. E. Br. He retained *H. flava* Salisb. as the type of the genus, ignoring the fact that this name apparently has no standing, having been improperly given to *Moraea longiflora* upon its transfer to *Helixyra* by Salisbury, and then made the valid new combination *H. longiflora* (Ker) N. E. Br., but kept both names as separate entities in his treatment of the genus.

More important still is the fact already mentioned, that he treated *Helixyra* Salisb. ex N. E. Br. and *Gynandriris* Parl. as synonymous. If this be correct, and it seems to be, the proper name for the genus is *Gynandriris*, since that is the first validly published generic name which properly includes the plant upon which Salisbury, and after him N. E. Brown, based the invalid genus *Helixyra*. On nomenclatural grounds the following treatment of the genus is proposed, without attempting a complete synonymy. Lack of material has prevented, for the time being, a taxonomic study of more than two species.

GYNANDRIRIS, Parlatores, Nuov. Gen. e Nuov. Spec. Piant. Monocot. 49 (1854). *Helixyra* Salisb., Trans. Hort. Soc. Lond. i. 305 (1812); nomen nudum; ex N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 348 (1929).

GYNANDRIRIS SISYRINCHIUM (L.) Parl., l. c., 52, type of the genus. *Iris Sisyrinchium* L., Sp. Pl. i. 40 (1753). *Moraea Sisyrinchium* (L.) Ker in Kon. and Sims, Ann. Bot. i. 241 (1805). *Iris fugax* Tenore, Fl. Nap. i. 15, t. 4 (1811). *Diaphane edulis* Salisb., Trans. Hort. Soc. Lond. i. 304 (1812). *Moraea Tenoreana* Sweet, Brit. Flow. Gard. ii. t. 110 (1825). *Moraea fugax* Tenore, Fl. Nap. iv. 10 (1830).

G. **Burchellii** (Baker), comb. nov. *Moraea Burchellii* Baker, Handbk. Irid. 57 (1892). *Helixyra Burchellii* (Baker) N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

G. **cladostachya** (Baker), comb. nov. *Moraea cladostachya* Baker, Handbk. Irid. 58 (1892). *Helixyra cladostachya* (Baker) N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

G. **elata** (N. E. Br.), comb. nov. *Helixyra elata* N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

G. **longiflora** (Ker), comb. nov. *Moraea longiflora* Ker, Bot. Mag., t. 712 (1804). *Helixyra flava* Salisb., Trans. Hort. Soc. Lond. i. 305 (1812). *Helixyra longiflora* (Ker) N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

G. **Mossii** (N. E. Br.), comb. nov. *Helixyra Mossii* N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 350 (1929).

G. **propinqua** (N. E. Br.), comb. nov. *Helixyra propinqua* N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

G. **Rogersii** (Baker), comb. nov. *Moraea Rogersii* Baker, Handbk. Irid. 57 (1892). *Helixyra Rogersii* (Baker) N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

In the same article in which this species was transferred from *Moraea* to *Helixyra*, Brown described another *Moraea Rogersii* N. E. Br., as a new species. This is, of course, a later homonym of Baker's species, and therefore it must be renamed, in the absence of a synonym:

MORAEA trifida, nom. nov. *Moraea Rogersii* N. E. Br. (non Baker), Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 344 (1929).

The name has been given because this species, as a member of the subgenus *Vieusseuxia*, on the authority of N. E. Brown, l. c., has petals which are tripartite in the upper portion.

GYNANDRIRIS **setifolia** (Linn. f.), comb. nov. *Iris setifolia* Linn. f., Suppl. 99 (1781). *Iris setacea* Thunb., Diss. Irid. 20, t. 1 (1782). *Moraea setacea* (Thunb.) Ker in Kon. and Sims, Ann. Bot. i. 240 (1805). *Moraea xerospata* MacOwan ex Baker, Flor. Cap. vi. 529 (1897). *Moraea setifolia* (Linn. f.) Druce, Rep. Bot. Exch. Cl. Brit. Isles, 1916: 636 (1917). *Helixyra setifolia* (Linn. f.) N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

G. **simulans** (Baker), comb. nov. *Moraea simulans* Baker, Handbk. Irid. 58 (1892). *Helixyra simulans* (Baker) N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

G. spicata (N. E. Br.), comb. nov. *Helixyra spicata* N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

G. spiralis (Baker), comb. nov. *Moraea spiralis* Baker, Handbk. Irid. 57 (1892). *Helixyra spiralis* (Baker) N. E. Br., Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xvii. 349 (1929).

G. torta (L. Bol.), comb. nov. *Moraea torta* L. Bol., S. Afr. Gard. xvii. 418 (1927). *Helixyra torta* (L. Bol.) T. T. Barnard, Iris Yrbk. (1932): 52 (Iris Society of England).

II. IRIS

IRIS AUREA Lindl. in Bot. Reg. xxxiii. t. 59 (1847).

This name was preceded by *I. aurea* Raf. in Atl. Journ. i. 80 (1830) and by *I. aurea* Link, Enum. Hort. Berol. i. 59 (1821). The former name was given to a variant of *I. Pseudacorus* L., while Link's name was apparently given to one of the innumerable color forms of *I. halophila* Pall. Lindley's plant, if specific status is to be retained, must be renamed *I. CROCEA* Jacquemont ex Baker (in synonym) in Gard. Chron. (II) vi. 584 (1876), which is the only synonym I have found.

IRIS TRIPETALA Walt., Fl. Carol. 66 (1788).

Seven years before the publication of Walter's species, the younger Linnaeus described an *Iris tripetala*, Suppl. 97 (1781). Although this was removed to *Moraea* by Ker, Bot. Mag. t. 702 (1803), it remains as a bar to Walter's name. The earliest synonym available is *I. TRIDENTATA* Pursh, Fl. Amer. Sept. i. 30 (1816).

IRIS FOLIOSA Mackenzie & Bush in Trans. Acad. Sci. St. Louis xii. 80 (1902).

This species, which is easily confused with *I. hexagona* Walt., is, in its most characteristic forms, undoubtedly distinct. It is necessary, however, to rename it *I. BREVICAULIS* Raf., Fl. Lud. 20, no. 55 (1817). This clear and unmistakable description of the plant now known as *I. foliosa* was amplified slightly by Rafinesque in his New Flora, part 2, p. 93 (1837). Unlike some of the other descriptions of *Iris* species given by Rafinesque, these are definite and recognizable.

IRIS NEPALENSIS D. Don, Prodr. Fl. Nep. 54 (1825).

One year before the description of Don's species, an *I. nepalensis* Wall. was described in Lindley's Botanical Register, t. 818 (1824). To judge from the figure and the description, this plant is merely a form of *I. germanica* L. In spite of certain differences in description and coloring, Don's plant seems conspecific with *I. DECORA* Wall., Pl. As. Rar. i. 77, 76 (1830), and probably should take that name as the earliest available synonym.

IRIS COERULEA B. Fedtsch. in Bull. Herb. Boiss. ser. 2, iv. 917 (1904).

This name is a later homonym of *I. coerulea* Spach, Hist. Veg. Phan. xiii. 50 (1846), a plant which does not seem separable from *I. pumila* L. As there seems to be no synonym available for Fedtschenko's species, I am renaming it

IRIS **albomarginata**, nom. nov. *I. coerulea* B. Fedtsch. in Bull. Herb. Boiss. ser. 2, iv. 917 (1904), not Spach (1846).

The name has been chosen with reference to the white margins of the leaves, a characteristic of several of the species of the *Juno* section.

III. ACIDANTHERA

ACIDANTHERA UNICOLOR Hochst. ex Baker in Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xvi. 160 (1877).

I have been unable to trace this name beyond the date and reference given above. According to Baker, who gave no description, the name is based upon *Schimper*, no. 2304 of Schimper's Pl. Abyss. In this case, the name is invalid, unless two or more species were sent out under this number, since in Linnaea xxxiv. 697 (1866) Ascherson and Klatt described a *Tritonia Schimper*, basing the species upon *Schimper*, no. 2304. As there seems to be no record of the previous use of the specific name *Schimper* in *Acidanthera*, the plant accordingly becomes

ACIDANTHERA **Schimper** (Aschers. & Klatt), comb. nov. *Tritonia Schimper* Aschers. & Klatt in Linnaea, xxxiv. 697 (1866).

ACIDANTHERA GRACILIS Pax in Engler's Bot. Jahrb. xv. 154 (1893). This species is based upon *Hildebrandt*, no. 2015, the type from which Baker described *Acidanthera zanzibarica*, in his Handbk. Irid. 188 (1892). In spite of the priority of Baker's name, he himself placed it in the synonymy of *A. gracilis* Pax, in Flor. Trop. Afr. vii. 359 (1899), in which he was followed by Ind. Kew. Suppl. i. 5 (1902). Unless the generally accepted date of publication of Baker's Handbook of the Irideae is incorrect, the earlier name should be restored to use.

ACIDANTHERA PLATYSEPALA Baker in Journ. Bot. xiv. 339 (1876). In Flor. Cap. vi. 131 (1896), Baker gave as a synonym of this species *Gladiolus longicollis* Baker, which he had described in Journ. Bot. xiv. 182 (1876). If this species is indeed an *Acidanthera*, the earlier specific name must be restored, so that it becomes

ACIDANTHERA **longicollis** (Baker), comb. nov. *Gladiolus longicollis* Baker in Journ. Bot. xiv. 182 (1876).

IXIA TUBULOSA Burm. f., Fl. Cap. Prodr. 1* (1768). Burmann's specimens were examined a few years ago by N. E. Brown, who re-

ported, Kew Bull. (1929): 137, that of the four, two are *Babiana tubulosa* (Burm. f.) Ker, Gen. Irid. 154 (1827), one is *Acidanthera flabellifolia* (De la Roche) N. E. Br., l. c., and one is *Acidanthera tubulosa* (Houtt.) N. E. Br., l. c.

In the original description, Burmann included two varieties, without separating them by name or by letter. The second mentioned, "foliis latioribus, petiolis foliorum longitudine contractis," with flowers "rufescentes maculis rubris," Brown takes as the type of the species, presumably because there are two specimens. Since it is a *Babiana*, he identified it with *Babiana tubulosa* (Burm. f.) Ker, which is correct, as Ker's reference, l. c., to Burmann shows. Of the two remaining specimens, Brown identified one as *Acidanthera flabellifolia* (De la Roche) N. E. Br., but the fourth, also an *Acidanthera*, could not be matched in the Kew Herbarium. It is this specimen which is the center of a nomenclatural tangle. Brown states that this is the plant from which fig. 2 of t. 78 in Houttuyn, Handleid. vol. 12 (1780) was drawn, the drawing being life-sized and very exact. Since it represents an *Acidanthera* and not a *Babiana*, Brown has named it *Acidanthera tubulosa* (Houtt.) N. E. Br. In his text, however, Houttuyn, l. c., p. 36, cites Burmann's description of *Ixia tubulosa*, showing that he was not describing a new *Ixia tubulosa*, but was reproducing Burmann's plant from one of Burmann's own specimens. This is further shown by the coloring of the flowers in the figure, which are "rufescentes maculis rubris," the coloring, that is, of the two specimens of *Babiana* which Brown regards as the type of *I. tubulosa* Burm. In other words, Houttuyn's plant is simply an incorrectly colored drawing of one of the four specimens upon which Burmann based his specific concept, *Ixia tubulosa*.

To segregate two species from one specific concept and give them the same specific name is clearly impossible. Since Ker was the first to use the name *tubulosa* in a new combination based upon Burmann's name, later segregates from Burmann's species cannot use that specific name, even if they are in different genera. The situation is further complicated by the fact that Baker, Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xvi. 160 (1877), Handbk. Irid. 186 (1892), and Flor. Cap. vi. 132 (1896), made a new combination, *Acidanthera tubulosa*, based on this same figure of Houttuyn. Brown, who has examined the specimens, states that the plant described by Baker is not the same as the Burmann specimen back of the Houttuyn figure, but is *Gladiolus exscapus* Thunb., Prodr. 184 (1800), which Baker had transferred to *Acidanthera* as *A. exscapa* (Thunb.) Baker in Berl. Monat. xix. 15 (1876). In

Flor. Cap. vi. 132 (1896), *A. exscapa* is made a synonym of *A. tubulosa* (Houtt.) Baker. This latter name is, of, course, open to the same objections nomenclaturally as Brown's *A. tubulosa*, and since it is, in addition, based upon a misidentification of the plant described with Houttuyn's figure, it is quite reasonable to accept Brown's suggestion that this be called *A. exscapa* (Thunb.) Baker, apparently the first legitimate synonym. At the same time, Brown's *A. tubulosa*, also, must be renamed, and no legitimate synonym seems available. My understanding of the nomenclature of the segregates from *Ixia tubulosa* Burm. f. is as follows:

BABIANA TUBULOSA (Burm. f.) Ker, Gen. Irid. 154 (1827). *Ixia tubulosa* Burm. f., Fl. Cap. Prodr. 1* (1768), in part.

ACIDANTHERA FLABELLIFOLIA (De la Roche) N. E. Br. in Kew Bull. (1929): 137. *Ixia flabellifolia* De la Roche, Descr. Pl. Nov. 20 (1766). *Ixia tubulosa* Burm. f., Fl. Cap. Prodr. 1* (1768), in part.

ACIDANTHERA **picta**, nom. nov. *Ixia tubulosa* Burm. f., Fl. Cap. Prodr. 1* (1768), in part; Houttuyn, Handleid. xii. t. 78, fig. 2 (1780). *Acidanthera tubulosa* (Houtt.) Baker in Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xvi. 160 (1877), and Handbk. Irid. 186 (1892), as to name, but not as to plant described. *Acidanthera tubulosa* (Houtt.) N. E. Br. in Kew Bull. (1929): 137.

This is Burmann's first variety, "foliis instar junci. . . Flores spicati distichi post evolutionem secundi in prima albescentes teneriores. . . ; amborum tubi tripollicares filiformes," preceded by the diagnosis "spathis appressis lanceolatis, tubis florum filiformibus."

In accordance with Brown's suggestion, Baker's plant becomes

ACIDANTHERA EXSCAPA (Thunb.) Baker, Berl. Monat. xix. 15 (1876). *Gladiolus exscapus* Thunb., Prodr. 184 (1800). *Acidanthera tubulosa* (Houtt.) Baker in Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xvi. 160 (1877), and Handbk. Irid. 186 (1892) as to plant described.

IV. TRITONIA

GLADIOLUS LONGIFLORUS Linn. f., Suppl. 96 (1781); Thunb., Diss. Glad. 19 (1784).

Of the Thunbergian specimens of *Gladiolus longiflorus*, N. E. Brown, Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xlviii. 24-25 (1928), states that they are actually specimens of *Tritonia*, and proposes for them the name *Tritonia longiflora* (Linn. f.) N. E. Br., since *Tritonia longiflora* Ker, Kon. and Sims, Ann. Bot. i. 228 (1805), belongs in the genus *Ixia*. As Ker had made a valid new combination in 1805, bringing the specific name *longiflora* into the genus *Tritonia*, Brown's name is a

later homonym and cannot stand. The history of the two species involved in the name *Tritonia longiflora* appears to be as follows.

In 1805, Ker transferred an *Ixia longiflora* to *Tritonia*, referring only to Bot. Mag. t. 256. This figure, published in 1794 as *Ixia longiflora*, gives two synonyms: *Ixia longiflora* of Aiton's Hort. Kew. i. 58 (1789); and *Gladiolus longiflorus* Linn. f., Suppl. 96 (1781). Aiton described it as "*Ixia foliis ensiformi-linearibus strictis, tubo filiformi longissimo*," and gave as synonyms *Ixia longiflora* Berg., Cap. 7 (1767), *Ixia paniculata* De la Roche, Descr. Pl. Nov. 26 (1766), and *Gladiolus longiflorus* Linn. f., l. c., and Thunb., l. c. Upon which of these was Aiton's *I. longiflora* based? In the synonymy, Bergius' species was cited first; furthermore, its diagnosis and description are alone in calling the perianth-tube "*filiformis*," a point which Aiton mentions in his diagnosis. The other three writers cited by Aiton do not use this term either in diagnosis or description. Aiton's plant, then, is probably *I. longiflora* Berg.

Nor was Aiton alone in considering *I. longiflora* Berg. and *Gladiolus longiflorus* Linn. f. identical. Thunberg, l. c., p. 24, gives in the synonymy of his *G. longiflorus* the same three names which Aiton later cited in synonymy. Nevertheless, Thunberg said of his plant, l. c., p. 20, "*Facies Ixiae, sed tubus curvus et situs limbi separat*," and, as Brown found on examination of Thunberg's specimens, the plant in question is a *Tritonia*. On the other hand, from the detailed and careful description given by Bergius, it would appear that his plant is indeed an *Ixia*.

Thunberg, and Aiton following him, regarded *I. longiflora* Berg. and *I. paniculata* De la Roche as identical. De la Roche's description is somewhat less detailed than that of Bergius, but his figure seems carefully drawn and about life-sized. Bergius' description and De la Roche's figure agree so closely in detail that, *ex descr.*, it would appear that the two are the same. In that case, De la Roche's name has priority. Incidentally, *I. paniculata* was described, and, therefore, presumably figured, from living plants, according to De la Roche.

In view of the preëmption of the name *Tritonia longiflora*, the Linnaean and Thunbergian plant must be renamed upon its transfer to *Tritonia*, in the apparent absence of a legitimate synonym. Accordingly it becomes

TRITONIA longituba, nom. nov. *Gladiolus longiflorus* Linn. f., Suppl. 96 (1781); Thunb., Diss. Glad. 19 (1784). *Tritonia longiflora* (Linn. f.) N. E. Br. in Journ. Linn. Soc. xlviii. 25 (1928).

TRITONIA COOPERI Baker, Handbk. Irid. 192 (1892). In Journ.

Bot. xiv. 237 (1876), Baker described a *Morphixia Cooperi*, which is now known as *Ixia Cooperi* Baker, the change having been made by Baker himself, Handbk. Irid. 166 (1892). Before this was done however, the plant in question had been renamed *Tritonia Cooperi* (Baker) Klatt, Ergänz. 24 (1882), a validly published new combination. After transferring this plant to *Ixia* (of which *Morphixia* is now recognized as a subgenus), Baker described a new species, naming it *Tritonia Cooperi*, Handbk. Irid. 192 (1892), basing it upon *Cooper*, no. 3182. As a later homonym of *Tritonia Cooperi* (Baker) Klatt, *T. Cooperi* Baker must be renamed. Since there is apparently no synonym available, I have named it

TRITONIA quinquenervata, nom. nov. *Tritonia Cooperi* Baker, Handbk. Irid. 192 (1892).

TRITONIA ROSEA Klatt in Linnaea xxxii. 760 (1863). This is a later homonym of *Tritonia rosea* (Jacq.) Ait., Hort. Kew. i. 91 (1810), based upon *Gladiolus roseus* Jacq., Ic. ii. 261, Coll. v. 22 (1796), a plant which, after being placed in *Gladiolus*, *Tritonia*, *Montbretia*, and *Houttuynia*, seems to have settled down as *Acidanthera capensis* (Houtt.) Benth. ex Baker, Handbk. Irid. 187 (1892). *T. rosea* Klatt must be renamed and an available synonym seems lacking. Therefore, I am renaming it

TRITONIA rubro-lucens, nom. nov. *T. rosea* Klatt in Linnaea xxxii. 760 (1863).

IXIA UNDULATA Burm. f., Fl. Cap. Prodr. 1 (1768). This plant has been removed to *Tritonia* and named *T. undulata* (Burm. f.) N. E. Br., Kew Bull. (1929): 137, but there are difficulties involved in the acceptance of this. Baker had previously made the same combination, *T. undulata* (Burm. f.) Baker in Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xvi. 163 (1877), citing Burmann's plant and also *Ixia crispa* Linn. f., Suppl. 91 (1781) in synonymy. After examining specimens and considering Baker's synonymy, Brown stated that the plant named *T. undulata* (Burm. f.) Baker was indeed identical with *Ixia crispa* Linn. f., but was not identical with *Ixia undulata* Burm. f. He therefore transferred the Linnæan plant to *Tritonia*, renaming it *T. Thunbergii* N. E. Br., since there was already a *T. crispa* (Linn. f.) Ker, based upon *Gladiolus crispus* Linn. f., Suppl. 94 (1781). The nomenclature should be as follows:

TRITONIA THUNBERGII N. E. Br. in Kew Bull. (1929): 137. *Ixia crispa* Linn. f., Suppl. 94 (1781). *Tritonia undulata* (Burm. f.) Baker in Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xvi. 163 (1877), and Handbk. Irid. 191 (1892), as to plant described.

TRITONIA UNDULATA (Burm. f.) Baker in Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xvi.

163 (1877), and Handbk. Irid. 191 (1892), as to name but not as to plant. *Ixia undulata* Burm. f., Fl. Cap. Prodr. 1 (1768). *Tritonia undulata* (Burm. f.) N. E. Br. in Kew Bull. (1929): 137.

V. IXIA

IXIA ROCHENSIS (Ker) L. Bol. in Journ. Bot. lv. 133 (1929). This new combination was based upon *Tritonia Rochensis* Ker in Bot. Mag. t. 1503 (1812), and is a later homonym of *Ixia Rochensis* Ker in Bot. Mag. t. 598 (1802). *I. Rochensis* was transferred to *Geissorhiza* by Ker, in Kon. and Sims, Ann. Bot. i. 224 (1805), but its brief existence in *Ixia* will, nevertheless, force the renaming of *I. Rochensis* (Ker) L. Bol. In the absence of an available synonym I am naming it

IXIA Bellendeni, nom. nov. *Tritonia Rochensis* Ker, in Bot. Mag. t. 1503 (1812). *Ixia Rochensis* (Ker) L. Bol. in Journ. Bot. lvii. 133 (1929).

The specific name recalls JOHN BELLENDEN KER.

IXIA ERECTA Thunb., Diss. Ixia, 16 (1783). According to N. E. Brown, Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xlviii. 46 (1928), who has examined the Thunberg specimens, this plant is quite distinct from *Ixia erecta* Berg., Cap. 5 (1767), which is a synonym of *I. polystachya* L., Sp. Pl. i. 51 (1762). Since that is so, Thunberg's name is a later homonym and the plant is here renamed

IXIA avellana, nom. nov. *Ixia erecta* Thunb., Diss. Ixia, 16 (1783).

The name is given because of Thunberg's description of the bulb as "magnitudine avellanae."

IXIA OVATA (Andr.) Sweet, Hort. Brit. (ed. 1) 499 (1827). The plant which in many treatments has been called *Geissorhiza excisa* (Linn. f.) Ker in Kon. and Sims, Ann. Bot. i. 223 (1805), based on *Ixia excisa* Linn. f., Suppl. 92 (1781), is apparently conspecific with *Ixia ovata* Burm. f., Fl. Cap. Prodr. 1 (1768). Although Burmann's name has been cited in the synonymy of *Ixia excisa* and *Geissorhiza excisa* since 1802 at least, it was not until 1906 that the plant was properly named *Geissorhiza ovata* (Burm. f.) Aschers. and Graebn., Synops. iii. 540 (1906). Burmann's name, however, stands as a bar to *Ixia ovata* (Andr.) Sweet, which is based upon *I. capitata* var. *ovata* Andr., Bot. Rep. i. t. 23 (1790). Apparently unaware that Sweet had made this change in status, Klatt made the same change to *Ixia ovata* (Andr.) Klatt, Ergänz. 62 (1882), basing it upon a reference to Andrews' plate. Sweet's name is here changed to

IXIA conferta, nom. nov. *Ixia capitata* var. *ovata* Andr., Bot. Rep. i. t. 23 (1790). *I. ovata* (Andr.) Sweet, Hort. Brit. (ed. 1) 499 (1827). *I. ovata* (Andr.) Klatt, Ergänz. 62 (1822).

VI. LAPEYROUSIA

LAPEYROUSIA MONTANA Hutchinson in Kew Bull. (1921): 403. This name is a later homonym of *L. montana* Klatt, *Ergänz.* 25 (1882). As there seems to be no available synonym, it is here renamed

LAPEYROUSIA **nigeriensis**, nom. nov. *L. montana* Hutchinson in Kew Bull. (1921): 403, not Klatt (1882).

LAPEYROUSIA MONTEIROI Baker in Flor. Trop. Afr. vii. 355 (1898). As a synonym of this species, Baker cites, l. c., *Anomatheca angolensis* Baker in Journ. Bot. xiv. 337 (1876). Obviously, the plant should not have been renamed in making the transfer to *Lapeyrousia*, and accordingly it becomes

LAPEYROUSIA **angolensis** (Baker), comb. nov. *Anomatheca angolensis* Baker in Journ. Bot. xiv. 337 (1876).

LAPEYROUSIA SETIFOLIA (Linn. f.) N. E. Br. in Journ. Linn. Soc., Bot. xlviii. 30 (1928). This name is based upon *Gladiolus setifolius* Linn. f., *Suppl.* 96 (1781); Thunb., *Diss. Glad.* 18 (1784). Since the transfer to *Lapeyrousia* was not made until 1928, however, N. E. Brown's name is a later homonym of *L. setifolia* Harms in Engler's Bot. Jahrb. xxx. 278 (1901). If the two species are distinct, it becomes necessary to rename *L. setifolia* (Linn. f.) N. E. Br. Search for an available synonym shows that Baker, *Handbk. Irid.* 170 (1892), placed *Gladiolus setifolius* Linn. f. in the synonymy of *Lapeyrousia divaricata* Baker, Journ. Bot. xiv. 337 (1876). If *G. setifolius* and *L. divaricata* are identical, and, in the absence of specimens, I am unable to consider this point, Baker's name must be used for the plant under discussion. That a name given to a species of *Lapeyrousia* in 1901 should force the abandonment of the same name for a species described in 1781 and shown, correctly, in 1892 to belong to *Lapeyrousia* is unfortunate, but under the present rules there is no alternative.

VII. MORAEA

MORAEA APHYLLA De Wildeman in Ann. Mus. Congo, ser. 4, ii. 21 (1913). This is a later homonym of *M. aphylla* Linn. f. *Suppl.* 99 (1781). I am renaming it

MORAEA **unifoliata**, nom. nov.

MORAEA AURANTIACA Baker in Fl. Trop. Africa vii. 575 (1898). This is a later homonym of *M. aurantiaca* A. Dietr. Sp. Pl. ii. 485 (1833) and since there seems to be no available synonym, I am renaming it

MORAEA **viscosa**, nom. nov. The new name refers to the fact that

the branches are viscous below the spathes, as Baker pointed out in his original description.

MORAEA GRACILIS Baker in Trans. Linn. Soc. ser. 2, i. 272 (1878). A new name must be found for this species, which is a later homonym of *M. gracilis* (Licht.) A. Dietr. Sp. Pl. ii. 478 (1833). With reference to the shape of the ovary, I suggest

MORAEA **clavata**, nom. nov.

MORAEA UNDULATA Ker, Gen. Irid. 43 (1827). This is a new name given by Ker to *Moraea crispa* Thunb., Diss. Mor. 13 (1787), apparently because of a new combination made by Ker in 1810. In that year, he transferred *Iris crispa* Linn. f., Suppl. 98 (1781), to *Moraea*, making it *M. crispa* (Linn. f.) Ker in Bot. Mag. t. 1284 (1810). Apparently, Ker reasoned that, since the specific name *crispa* had been first used by Linnaeus fil., it should take precedence over Thunberg's name, despite the fact that Ker's new combination bringing the Linnaean name into *Moraea* was not made for over twenty years after Thunberg had described his *M. crispa*. Since this is incorrect, Thunberg's plant should have its original name restored, *Moraea crispa* Thunb., non (Linn. f.) Ker.

Even if Ker had been correct in changing the name, his choice for a new name was unfortunate, since *M. undulata* Ker is a later homonym of *M. undulata* (L.) Thunb., Diss. Mor. 14 (1787), based upon *Ferraria undulata* L., Sp. Pl. ii. 1353 (1763). Thunberg's new combination has not been retained, and the plant is generally regarded as belonging in *Ferraria*. Nevertheless, its temporary stay in *Moraea* will prevent use of the specific name *undulata* for any species of *Moraea*.

Although Ker was incorrect in changing Thunberg's name, he was correct in transferring *Iris crispa* Linn. f. to *Moraea*, so that it is this plant which must be renamed. The first legitimate synonym seems to be MORAEA DECUSSATA Klatt, Ergänzt. 33 (1882). Making *M. crispa* (Linn. f.) Ker a synonym, Klatt incorporated, almost verbatim, large portions of Ker's description of this plant in his own description.

VIII. MISCELLANY

ANTHOLYZA ZAMBESIACA Baker, Handbk. Irid. 232 (1892). It was pointed out by N. E. Brown, Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xx. 277 (1932), that this species was originally described from a mixture which included leaves of a species of *Vellozia*, a portion of the stem of some iridaceous plant, and flowers which are identical with those of *Antholyza magnifica* Harms, in Warb. Kunene-Zamb. Exped. 201 (1903).

In view of the identity of the flowers, Brown preferred to retain Baker's specific name in making the transfer to his new genus *Petamenes*, as *P. zambesiacus* (Baker) N. E. Br., l. c. Since that time, however, the adoption of the new rules for botanical nomenclature forces the rejection of names based upon mixtures. For that reason, this species must be renamed

PETAMENES **magnifica** (Harms), comb. nov. *Antholyza magnifica* Harms, in Warb. Kunene-Zamb. Exped. 201 (1903). *Antholyza zambesiaca* Baker, Handbk. Irid. 232 (1892). *Petamene szambesiacus* (Baker) N. E. Br. in Trans. Roy. Soc. S. Afr. xx. 277 (1932).

ARISTEA CYANEA De Wild., Plant. Bequaert. i. 51 (1921). A later homonym of *A. cyanea* Ait., Hort. Kew. i. 67 (1789), this plant is here renamed

ARISTEA **stipitata**, nom. nov. *A. cyanea* De Wild., Plant. Bequaert. i. 51 (1921), not Ait. (1789).

GEISSORHIZA SCHLECHTERI Baker in Bull. Herb. Boiss. ser. 2, i. 863 (1901). This species was somewhat inadequately described from *Schlechter*, no. 4701, collected in the Transvaal. A sheet of this collection in the Gray Herbarium agrees with Baker's description, and is clearly not *Hesperantha Baurii* Baker, as labelled by the collector. Dissection of one of the flowers showed that the style-branches are about twice the length of the undivided style, indicating that the plant is a *Hesperantha*, as its collector believed. Accordingly, it becomes

HESPERANTHA **Schlechteri** (Baker), comb. nov. *Geissorhiza Schlechteri* Baker in Bull. Herb. Boiss. ser. 2, i: 863 (1901).



Foster, Robert C. 1936. "Notes on nomenclature in Iridaceae." *Contributions from the Gray Herbarium of Harvard University* (114), 37–50.

<https://doi.org/10.5962/p.336181>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/122967>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/p.336181>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/336181>

Holding Institution

Missouri Botanical Garden, Peter H. Raven Library

Sponsored by

Missouri Botanical Garden

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Permission to digitize granted by rights holder

Rights Holder: Harvard University Herbaria

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

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

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