

*Daly* 19, April 8, 1951 (SMU) ; same place and date, *Shinners* 12968 (SMU). CHEROKEE Co.: Jacksonville, *Tharp*, April 20, 1933 (T).

## REFERENCES

- CHOISY, J. D. 1849. *Nyctaginaceae-Mirabileae*. DC., Prodrum 13 pt. 2: 427-436.  
 FERNALD, MERRITT LYNDON. 1950. *Mirabilis*. Gray's Manual of Botany ed. 8, p. 606.  
 HEIMERL, DR. ANTON. 1901. Studien eber einige Nyctaginaceen des Herbarium Delessert. Ann. Conserv. & Jard. Bot. Geneve 5:177-197.  
 RYDBERG, P. A. 1902. Studies on the Rocky Mountain flora — IX. The Nyctaginaceae of the Rocky Mountain region. Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 29: 680-693. (*Allionia*, pp. 688-693.)  
 STANDLEY, PAUL CARPENTER. 1909. The Allionaceae of the United States with notes on Mexican species. Contrib. U.S. Nat. Herb. 12: 303-389. (*Allionia*, pp. 334-357.)  
 ————. 1918. Allionaceae. N. Amer. Fl. 21 pt. 3: 171-254. (*Allionia*, pp. 217-230.)  
 ————. 1931. [Comments on generic unity of *Mirabilis* and segregates, in] Studies of American plants — V. Field Mus. Publ. Bot. Ser. 8 pt. 5: 304-307.  
 WEATHERBY, C. A. 1913. Some new combinations required by the International Rules. Proc. Amer. Acad. 49: 492. (Contrib. Gray Herb. 42/3.) Consists of nine new combinations or names under *Oxybaphus*.

## Biological Notes

OCULAR ASYMMETRY IN CERTAIN TEXAS ISOPODS.—Van Name, in his 1936 monograph of American land and fresh-water isopods, gives (p. 237) the number of ommatidia ("ocelli") in the species *Porcellio (Porporcellio) quadriseriatus* Verh. as "about eighteen, well-formed." A careful examination of ten male individuals (*coll.* Dallas, Texas, May 15-June 1, 1932), gave the following results:

Individual	Number of Ommatidia	
	Left eye	Right eye
A	26	23
B	20	7
C	18	23
D	22	20
E	12	21
F	23	15
G	23	23
H	20	22
I	21	20
J	17	23

All of the ommatidia appeared to be well developed and well pigmented; I observed no poorly-developed or -pigmented "ocelli" such as have been reported for various species of *Philoscia*, *Trichorina*, and *Cubaris*. The eyes were examined under conditions that precluded the possibility of miscounting. The query under Individual B is due to the loss of the preparation during the examination.—*S. W. Geiser*.

VITIS MUSTANGENSIS Buckley var. *diversa* (L. H. Bailey) Shinners, comb. nov.—*V. candicans* Engelm. var. *diversa* L. H. Bailey, Gentes Herb. 3: 190. 1934. In *Plantae Lindheimerianae II* (Boston Journ. Nat. Hist. 6): 166, 1850, Gray remarks, "Under the name of *V. candicans*, (*n. sp.*) *Engelm. ined.*, I have from Lindheimer, as also from Mr. Wright, Texas specimens of what appears to be a variety of *V. Californica*, *Benth.*, with the leaves somewhat less dentate and more densely tomentose beneath." This certainly does not constitute valid publication of a new species. Rehder is doubly in error in maintaining *V. candicans* as the correct name, and attributing it to "Engelm. & Gray" (Bibliog. Cult. Trees & Shrubs, p. 446, 1949). *Vitis candicans* Engelm. was not actually published until 1887, by Planchon, in DC., Mon. Phan. 5: 326, twenty-five years after Buckley had named and described the same species (Proc. Acad. Phila. 13 [1861]: 451, 1862). Gray sharply criticized Buckley for disregarding Engelm's name, and for using what he thought was an improper adjectival form, implying that a geographic location was referred to (Proc. Acad. Phila. 14 [1862]: 162, 1863). Buckley quite justly replied that Engelm had not really described and published the species, and that the adjectival specific name referred not to the animal, but to a stream bearing that name (ibid. 22 [1870]: 136-137, 1870).—*Lloyd H. Shinners*.