

TABLE I. SCALATION OF EUMECES ANTHRACINUS

No.	Sex	Scale rows at midbody	Dorsals	Ventrals	Supra-labials	Infra-labials	Post-mental	Post-nasal	Total	Length ¹ S-V
SMU 138	m	23	48	55	7-7	7-8	1	1-1	76	38
SMU 139	f	22	47	50	7-7	7-6	1	none	66 ²	50

The median subcaudal scales are wider than long. Both specimens show the prefrontals in close contact with each other for a short distance and not separated by the contact of the frontal and the fronto-nasal. Dowling (*Copeia*, No. 3, 1950, p. 235) found such separation in specimens from Tuscaloosa County, Ala.

The dark coloration, indistinct pattern, and presence of a faint median dorsal light line agree with Smith's comments on his "western" population of *Eumeces anthracinus*, for which he proposes to retain the name *E. a. pluvialis* Cope (Smith, *Handbook*, 1946, pp. 374-5)—However, until further study is made of these groups, we will follow the nomenclature of Stejneger and Barbour (*Checklist of North American Amphibians and Reptiles*, Ed. 5, 1943).

Both specimens have been deposited in the Southern Methodist University collection (nos. SMU 138-9).—DONALD TINKLE & LAWRENCE CURTIS, Students, Southern Methodist University, Dallas.

RHUS AROMATICA Ait. var. *flabelliformis* Shinners, var. nov.—A specie differt foliis maturis minoribus glabris, foliolis terminalibus cuneato-obovatis obtusis etiam subtruncatis 1.5-2.5 cm. longis 0.8-2 cm. latis (ramulorum serotinorum sive opacorum etiam 3.3 cm. longis 2.5 cm. latis) obtuse lobatis dentatisve. Mature leaves glabrous, smaller than in the species, firm or slightly coriaceous; terminal leaflet cuneate-obovate, obtuse or with wide, almost truncate tip, 1.5-2.5 cm. long (including petiolar base), 0.8-2 cm. wide (as much as 3.3 cm. long and 2.5 cm. wide on late leafy shoots or on shaded plants). TYPE: Frequent in woods along ravine, Bluebird Avenue, Oakhurst, Fort Worth, Tarrant Co., Texas, *V. L. Cory 54413*, May 9, 1948, in fruit (in Herb. Southern Methodist University). A common shrub, chiefly of calcareous outcrops, but also in the sandy Cross Timbers, from the Blackland Prairies westward. The following collections from central Texas are typical.

COOKE Co.: 7.5 miles north of Gainesville, *Lloyd H. Shinners 12450*. DALLAS Co.: Urbandale, *C. L. & Amelia A. Lundell 8411*. Off Hillcrest Road 7 miles north of S.M.U. Campus, *Lundell & Lundell 10144*. DENTON Co.: 15.5 miles west of Denton, *Shinners 12308*. ERATH Co.: ½ mile east of Bluff Dale, *Eula Whitehouse 15426*. Five miles northeast of Stephenville, *Shinners 11065*. FANNIN Co.: 5.6 miles west-southwest of Honey Grove, *Shinners 12289*. HOOD Co.: 6¼ miles south of Granbury, *Cory 53754*. JACK Co.: 10 miles southeast of Jacksboro, *Shinners 12361*. JOHNSON Co.: 13½ miles southwest of Cleburne, *Shinners 11271*. MCLENNAN Co.: Waco, *Cory 55794*. SOMERVELL Co.: 3 miles south of Glen Rose, *Shinners 11289*. TARRANT Co.: without specific locality, *Albert Ruth 357*, June 2, 1929. South of Crowley, *Whitehouse 16115*. TRAVIS Co.: Austin, *Whitehouse*, May 13, 1940. WISE Co.: 1 mile west of Bridgeport, *Whitehouse 15263*. About 2½ miles west of Rhome, *Whitehouse 15091*.

This has long been incorrectly treated as *R. trilobata* Nutt., a species from the central Rocky Mountains (e.g., by Barkley in Lundell, Fl. Texas 3: 102, 1943), but it has the characteristic hairy fruits of *R. aromatica* of the eastern and central United States (cf. Fernald, *Rhodora* 43: 599-603, 1941). It certainly is not to be separated specifically from *R. aromatica* var. *serotina* (Greene) Rehder, of sandy woods in eastern Texas, westward along the Red River to Grayson County. Similarly, the densely pubescent-leaved plant of the Panhandle and Trans-Pecos is to be treated with it, as *R. aromatica* var. *pilosissima*

¹in millimeters
²tail incomplete

(Engler) Shinnars, comb. nov. (*R. trilobata* var. *pilosissima* Engler in DC., Mon. Phan. 4: 386, 1883). Dr. Barkley's treatment of Texas *Rhus* (under several segregate genera) is quite superficial and frequently inaccurate. No mention is made of *R. copallina* var. *leucantha* (Jacq.) DC. and *R. copallina* var. *latifolia* Engler, credited to Texas by earlier authors; nor of *Schmaltzia pulchella* and *S. sabulosa* Greene, based on collections made by Charles Wright on the Rio Limpio and Rio San Pedro of Texas, respectively; nor of *S. leiocarpa* and *S. Emoryi* Greene from southeastern New Mexico, nor of *S. tridophylloides* Greene from Oklahoma, all surely warranting mention in a supposedly definitive flora of Texas. The distribution patterns of Texas species and varieties given by Dr. Barkley frequently are quite discordant with those common in the Texas flora. I have examined only a few of the specimens cited by Dr. Barkley, but two are illustrative, and I cannot help but believe that a number of other records in the Flora of Texas are the result of misidentifications. *Lundell & Lundell 11199*, labeled *R. glabra*, cited in the Flora (p. 96) as "*R. lanceolata* Gray" [the proper citation under the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature is *R. lanceolata* (Gray) Britton], collected in oak-pine forest in Jasper County, is actually *R. copallina* var. *latifolia* Engler. *R. copallina* var. *lanceolata* Gray (as I prefer to treat it) is the narrow-leaflet, limestone outcrop congener of var. *latifolia* common from the Blackland Prairies westward, certainly not to be expected in sandy oak-pine woods in extreme eastern Texas. Var. *latifolia*, with broad leaflets, is the plant of sandy soils westward to the East Cross Timbers, rarely to the West Cross Timbers near the Red River. *Lundell & Lundell 11325*, labeled *Schmaltzia trilobata*, cited (p. 102) as *S. crenata*, from Wood County, is actually *Rhus aromatica* var. *serotina* (Greene) Rehder (the same plant treated by Barkley as *Schmaltzia trilobata* var. *serotina*). All of the nine sheets from eastern Texas at hand I consider to belong to this variety. — LLOYD H. SHINNARS, Director of the Herbarium, Southern Methodist University.

The Sweet Clovers (*Melilotus*) of Texas

Joe F. Hennen¹

The sweet clovers are of great economic importance in Texas as honey plants, soil builders, and forage crops, especially in the blackland prairie regions. *Melilotus alba* and its varieties are the most important. The 1937 Yearbook of Agriculture lists the following varieties of *M. alba* (pages 1204-1206): Grundy County, Arctic, Alpha, Iowa Late White, Ohio Evergreen, Madrid White, and Hubam (an annual mutant). The last two named are the most important in Texas. No attempt has been made to differentiate these varieties taxonomically.

The three Texas species of sweet clover are easily distinguished when flowers are present, as shown in the key below. Vegetatively, however, *M. alba* and *M. officinalis* are difficult to separate. *M. indica* can usually be recognized by its low or sometimes prostrate growth and especially by its character-

¹Department of Agricultural Botany, Purdue University.