NOTES ON THE LOBELIAS IN THE HERBARIUM OF STEPHEN ELLIOTT

ROGERS MCEVAUGH

While in Charleston, South Carolina, in June 1937, the writer had the opportunity, through the kindness of Mrs. Frances Barrington and Mr. Robert Lunz, Jr., of the staff of the Charleston Museum, to examine the Lobelias in the herbarium of Stephen Elliott. The Elliott collection was of special interest because of the uncertain application of the names of several Lobelias mentioned in the “Sketch.”

“Lobelia amoena Mich.,” “Lobelia Claytoniana Mich.,” “Lobelia puberula Mich.” and “Lobelia pallida Muhl.” are all included by Elliott, and, as type material of these species has so far not been found, it was thought his herbarium, being nearly contemporaneous with those of Michaux and Muhlenberg, might throw some light upon the identities of the above species. It was hoped to discover also the identity of L. puberula var. glabella Elliott.

The collection now contains sixteen specimens of the genus Lobelia, all from the United States. Following is the complete list:

1. L. Cardinalis L. No data with specimen.
2. L. siphilitica L. No data with specimen.
4. L. glandulosa Walt. Labelled “in humidis” and with what is apparently a corruption of Michaux’s L. erassiuscula.
6. L. spicata Lam., var. leplostachys (A.DC.) Mack. & Bush. Two specimens: one labelled “Carol. Sept. Dr. Schweinitz” and with an unpublished name credited to Schreber; the other labelled “L. Claytoniana; hab. juxta Columbiam, S. C., Mr. Herbemont.”

1 ELLIOTT, STEPHEN. A Sketch of the Botany of South Carolina and Georgia 2 vols. Charleston, 1816-1824.
2 ELLIOTT, op. cit. 1: 267.
7. *L. spicata* Lam., var. *originalis* McVaugh. No data with specimen? This plant is on the same sheet with the next, and it is possible that the data given are meant to apply to both.

8. *L. spicata* Lam., var. *scapos* McVaugh. Labelled "Lobelia pallida. Hab. Mar. Mr. Oemler." Also labelled with a capital "P" which begins a word; the rest of the word has been torn off, and may possibly have been "Penn," indicating that the plant came from Maryland or Pennsylvania.

9. *L. inflata* L. Two specimens: one labelled "Mr. Percival"; the other labelled "Hab. Penn."


11. *L. Nuttalli* R. & S. Two specimens: one labelled "L. gracilis" and "Hab. Carol. Sept. Dr. Schweinitz"; the other labelled "L. Kalmii, Mai-Aug. in humidis frequens."

12. *L. Kalmii* L. Two specimens: one labelled "Mr. Whitlow, New York"; the other was sent to Elliott by John Torrey and is labelled with an unpublished name of Eddy's and "in the western part of the state of New York (Eddy)."

Reference to the above list enables us to place some of Elliott's names with certainty. He lists in the "Sketch" a total of 9 species, of which 4 (*L. Cardinalis, L. siphilitica, L. puberula, L. inflata*) are plainly the species now known by the same names. His interpretation of "L. glandulosa Walt." is probably the same as the modern one, while his "L. Kalmii" of Carolina and Georgia is *L. Nuttalli* R. & S.

As previously pointed out, the identity of *L. amoenia* Michaux is not surely known; his description may apply to what is now called *L. elongata* Small. The presence of a plant of the latter species, labelled "L. amoenia? Mich.," in Elliott's herbarium, makes it probable that "L. amoenia" of the "Sketch" was not the mountain and upland plant now passing by that name, but the Coastal Plain species native about Charleston. Since the elder Michaux also was familiar with the low country of South Carolina, it may well be that his "Lobelia amoenia" refers to the same plant and that we are using the name wrongly at present. Until evidence to the contrary is presented, however, we must use Small's name for the coastal plant.

Another specific name of somewhat doubtful application is Michaux's *Lobelia Claytoniana*. It was referred by the writer to *L. spicata* var. *originalis*, but a recent letter from Professor F. E. Wimmer of

Vienna states that in the Delessert Herbarium there is a specimen of *L. Claytoniana*, sent by Michaux himself, which differs from *L. spicata* Lamarck by the presence of well-marked calyx-appendages. Professor Wimmer considers this plant to be closely related to, or identical with, *L. leptostachys* A.DC. In view of these facts, it is interesting to see that Elliott's "Lobelia Claytoniana" from Columbia, S. C. is the plant now known as *L. spicata* Lam., var. *leptostachys* (A.DC.) Mack. & Bush.

In the "Sketch" the author states that he has seen material of "Lobelia pallida" from Pennsylvania, Tennessee, St. Mary's, Georgia and the low country of South Carolina. His herbarium indicates that "L. pallida" from Pennsylvania was *L. spicata* var. *scaposa*, and that that from St. Mary's, Ga., was *L. paludosa* Nutt. This bears out the conclusions previously stated by the present writer.

The only new name proposed by Elliott was a variety *glabella* of *Lobelia puberula*, referred to above. The type locality was given as Chatham Co., Georgia. This variety was said to be very smooth, with linear-lanceolate leaves, and to be a possible intermediate between *L. puberula* and *L. glandulosa*. No material of it was found in the Elliott herbarium, so that the correct application of the name remains in doubt. However, the description given by Elliott leads one to suppose that he had in mind a smooth, nearly eglandular plant of *L. glandulosa*; such individuals are not uncommon in that species. *L. puberula* var. *glabella* Ell. probably does not refer to *L. elongata* Small, however, as was previously stated; Elliott was evidently familiar with *L. elongata*, under the name of "L. amoena."
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All specimens cited below may be found in the Herbarium of the Missouri Botanical Garden.