Phytologia (February 1990) 68(2):114-155.

TAXONOMIC SUMMARY OF ERICAMERIA (ASTERACEAE: ASTEREAE), WITH THE INCLUSION OF HAPLOPAPPUS SECTS. MACRONEMA AND ASIRIS

Guy L. Nesom

Department of Botany, University of Texas, Austin Texas 78713 U.S.A.

ABSTRACT

Ericameria sensu stricto (12 species) is broadened to include the species of sect. Stenotopsis (1 species), sect. Macronema (Nutt.) Nesom (9 species) and sect. Asiris (H.M. Hall) Nesom (5 species). The nomenclature for the 27 species of Ericameria as so defined is summarized and criteria for the distinction of the sections are presented in a key. New specific combinations are proposed for E. compacta, E. crispa, E. discoidea, E. gilmanii, E. greenei, E. obovata, E. ophitidis, E. suffruticosa, E. watsonii and E. zionis. One new varietal combination is proposed, Ericameria discoidea var. linearis.

KEY WORDS: Ericameria, Haplopappus, Asteraceae, Astereae.

Ericameria has been understood to include a group of subshrubby species with narrow, entire, punctate-resinous leaves, small heads commonly in corymboid capitulescences and a base chromosome number of x=9. The genus has not been generally accepted by floristicians since Hall's treatment of it as Haplopappus sect. Ericameria (Hall 1928), although recent studies (primarily Johnston 1970 and Urbatsch, 1975; 1976; 1978; 1979) have recognized it as distinct.

Nesom, et al. (submitted) have sharpened the definition of Ericameria by removing from it as a separate genus, seven species (see Excluded Species, below) closely related to Euthamia, but distantly related to species traditionally recognized as Haplopappus. Plants of the new genus can be distinguished morphologically by characteristics of their involucral bracts, which have a white indurated, enervate basal portion and a glandular herbaceous patch on the upper portion, and their disc corollas, which are zygomorphic, the lobes strongly uneven in length. In contrast, plants of Ericameria have involucral bracts without an apical glandular patch, but with a clear midvein from base to tip and their disc corollas are regular with lobes of even length.

Although Hall (1928) segregated the species of Haplopappus sect. Asiris within his broad concept of Haplopappus, some were originally included in Ericameria by Nuttall, and some were again included in that genus by Urbatsch in his contribution to a checklist of North American plants (Kartesz & Kartesz 1980). One of the six species originally recognized by Hall in sect. Asiris, H. purpusii, is included in the new genus being described by Nesom, et al. (submitted). A connection between Macronema (Haplopappus sect. Macronema) and Ericameria has not been generally recognized, although Macbride (1918, see comments below) transferred Haplopappus bloomeri to Ericameria. A close similarity between sect. Macronema and sect. Asiris, however, has been acknowledged as they are treated together in keys (e.g., Ferris 1960; Cronquist 1973). Ericameria linearifolia, one of the two species of Stenotopsis (Haplopappus sect. Stenotopsis), has been transferred to Ericameria by Urbatsch & Wussow (1979). The other species, E. parrasana, is part of the new genus.

An overview of the taxonomy of *Ericameria* has not been published since Hall's treatment of *Haplopappus*. In the course of studying the generic boundaries of *Ericameria* for a floristic treatment of the Mexican species as well as for the separation of a new genus, I have arrived at a broadened view of the former, which is presented below.

There are two primary areas of difficulty in formulating a clear definition of *Ericameria*, the first involving sect. *Stenotopsis*, the second involving sects. *Macronema* and *Asiris*.

Section Stenotopsis

The first problem involves the relationship of typical Ericameria with E. linearifolia, which was segregated as the genus Stenotopsis Rydb. and included as one of the two species of Haplopappus sect. Stenotopsis (Rydb.) H.M. Hall. Extensive and well documented natural hybridization (Urbatsch & Wussow 1979; Cody & Thompson 1986) exists between E. linearifolia, which has long, merely bracteate peduncles with large, solitary heads with long, prominent ray flowers and 3 veined, stipitate glandular phyllaries, and E. cooperi, which is morphologically more typical of Ericameria. These two species have similarly colored pappus bristles and similarly shaped style appendages, and because of this, they are considered by Urbatsch & Wussow to be closely related and both placed in Ericameria sect. Stenotopsis. Considering the large differences between these two species, however, the small morphological similarities used by these workers to unite them are likely to be fortuitous. If the main criterion for associating the two species is ease of hybridization, attempts of artificial crosses between E. linearifolia and other species of Ericameria should be considered in the formulation of more meaningful hypotheses of close relationship. This is particularly true in view of the natural hybrids known between Haplopappus macronema and Chrysothamnus nauseosus (Anderson & Reveal 1966), which also are extremely divergent in morphology.

Although Ericameria linearifolia falls outside the boundaries of typical Ericameria in some features, it produces somewhat flattened, 6-8 nerved achenes and punctate leaves, which are characteristic of the genus. Its large, solitary heads and long ray flowers are more similar to those of species of sect. Macronema. Ericameria cooperi is much more similar to typical Ericameria in its small, discoid, apically clustered heads, but its turbinate-subcylindric achenes with 10-12 thin nerves are atypical.

Sections Macronema and Asiris

The second problem in defining *Ericameria* involves its distinction from *Haplopappus* sects. *Macronema* and *Asiris*. The following key provides contrasts that, with the caveats discussed below, separate these groups from *Ericameria* and *Stenotopsis*.

- - 2. Heads mostly in panicles or corymboid capitulescences, solitary in one species; phyllaries 1 nerved, papillate glandular in one species but not stipitate glandular; ray flowers absent or with short, inconspicuous ligulessect. *Ericameria*
 - 2' Heads solitary; phyllaries 3 nerved, stipitate glandular; ray flowers with long, prominent ligules sect. Stenotopsis
- - 3. Heads relatively large, solitary to clustered, immediately subtended by leaf like bracts; involucral bracts apically apiculate to appendaged, with a definite, orange resinous midvein, not keeled; achenes cylindric to slightly compressed, 5 nervedsect. Macronema

3' Heads relatively small, clustered, without definite leaf like bracts; involucral bracts apically apiculate, with a thin, greenish yellow midvein, often slightly keeled; achenes distinctly flattened, 3-4 nerved sect. Asiris

Ericameria, Macronema and Asiris each comprise species with variably shaped leaves and solitary to clustered heads variable in size. The heads in both may be eradiate or radiate with ray corollas variable in size. The distinction between them appears to lie in the nature of the leaf glandularity, the shape and nervation of the achenes and the shape of the style branch collecting appendages and their length relative to the stigmatic portion. The species of sect. Asiris and those of sect. Macronema are more closely similar between themselves, as evidenced by their apiculate involucral bracts, long linear style appendages and few nerved achenes. The species of sect. Asiris are divergent from the species of Macronema in their narrower heads with more thinly herbaceous involucral bracts and their peduncles that are not so strongly leafy.

The definition, however, between Ericameria and Macronema loses significant clarity because of overlapping variation in both groups. This is particularly true in Ericameria, where E. pinifolia is strongly similar to Macronema in its apiculate to appendaged involucral bracts, linear style branches longer than the stigmatic portions and narrowly cylindrical achenes. Further, the leaves of some plants of this species are not at all punctate. The generic affinity of E. pinifolia has never been questioned and it belongs firmly in Ericameria, where it is closely related to the type species of the genus, E. ericoides, which also shows some of the same Macronema like features. The differences between the groups in achene shape and nervation are not constant, because E. palmeri has achenes typical of Macronema, terete with (4-)5(-7) nerves. The achenes of E. cooperi are terete to slightly compressed, and along with those of several other species, E. parishii and E. pinifolia, may produce up to 12 nerves.

Finally, some plants of Haplopappus (sect. Macronema) bloomeri produce leaves that clearly are punctate resinous. Macbride's (1918) transferral of this species to Ericameria was made without specific comment, but perhaps reflected his reliance upon this criterion to distinguish Ericameria. Haplopappus bloomeri is highly variable in a number of other characteristics, as evidenced by the number of infraspecific taxa that have been named within it (see Hall 1928). Ericameria pinifolia is equally as variable, and because the variability in each species includes forms that are morphologically "shifted" toward the other, an investigation of these species for the possibility of hybridization should be interesting.

Parallel variation in Chrysothamnus

Chrysothamnus appears to be very closely related to Ericameria and Macronema, particularly the latter (Anderson 1970), but it is generally accepted as a distinct genus (Hall & Clements 1923; Blake 1926; Anderson 1984). It is more homogenous than either *Ericameria* or *Macronema* in its densely arranged, narrow, strictly eradiate heads and its involucral bracts in vertical files. Substantial variation occurs within *Chrysothamnus*, however, in the same characters that separate *Ericameria* from *Macronema* (Anderson 1970). The leaves of most species are resinous but non punctate, yet they are punctate in others. The achenes are variable in shape (terete to flattened) and in number of nerves, and the style branch collecting appendages vary from shorter to longer than the stigmatic portions. The species have been arranged into sections by Anderson (1984) to account for aspects of this variability.

Other x=9 groups of Haplopappus: Hesperodoria, Petradoria, Stenotus, Tonestus and Oreochrysum

Hesperodoria E. Greene (Haplopappus sect. Hesperodoria [E. Greene] H.M. Hall), with slightly resinous punctate leaves, may be related to the group of genera around Ericameria, but its scabrous margined leaves and strongly turbinate heads are unlike any species there. In its general habit, it is more like Petradoria, whose composition and systematic position has been somewhat ambiguous, although it appears to be closely related to Chrysothamnus (Anderson 1963; 1983; 1984).

Stenotus Nutt. (Haplopappus sect. Stenotus [Nutt.] A. Gray) appears to be situated outside of the closely related elements of the Ericameria group, contrary to an earlier hypothesis (Nesom 1989). In contrast to Ericameria and Macronema, as well as Chrysothamnus (excluding Petradoria), plants of Stenotus are uniformly low, caespitose and monocephalous herbs. They are perennials, but on the basis of morphology, Stenotus clearly does not belong in the Ericameria-Asiris-Macronema lineage as a "woody shrub" as indicated by Clark, et al. (1980), although it is similar in flavonoids to those taxa.

Plants of Tonestus A. Nels. (Haplopappus sect. Tonestus [A. Nels.] H.M. Hall) are also herbaceous and they are further characterized by thick caudex branches or rhizomes, plants mostly single stemmed from the base, leaves with a strong tendency to produce spinulose toothed margins and thin herbaceous bracts that nearly enclose the heads. Some of the species of Stenotus have been confused with Tonestus but the latter is clearly not a member of the Ericameria-Macronema alliance (Nesom & Morgan, submitted). Plants of the monotypic Oreochrysum Rydb. (Haplopappus sect. Oreochrysum [Rydb.] H.M. Hall) are rhizomatous, non resinous herbs with broad, relatively thin, clasping leaves and herbaceous, reflexing involucral bracts and could only be distantly related to Ericameria. Anderson & Creech (1975) included it within Solidago. Apart from Ericameria and its close relatives as recognized in the present paper, and from Hesperodoria and Petradoria, the species of Stenotus, Tonestus and Oreochrysum are the others of Haplopappus (sensu Hall 1928) with a base chromosome number of x=9.

In summary, the species of Ericameria (12), Stenotopsis (1), Macronema (9) and sect. Asiris (5) constitute four apparently closely related lineages that are overlapping in morphology. Natural hybridization occurs between Ericameria and Stenotopsis. On morphological grounds, Chrysothamnus is also closely related to these groups and natural hybrids are known between Macronema and Chrysothamnus, but Chrysothamnus is generally accepted as a distinct genus. To provide a taxonomic framework for these four sections of Haplopappus sensu Hall that are closely related to Chrysothamnus, there are several options. First, Ericameria, Stenotopsis, Macronema and Asiris might each be recognized as a separate genus, or Ericameria (with Stenotopsis) and Macronema (with Asiris) could be recognized, but in either case, there would be no morphological features to consistently separate the generic units. Alternatively, Ericameria could be expanded to bring the species of all four sections into a single taxon of coordinate rank with Chrysothamnus, resulting in the recognition of two closely related genera with similar patterns of variation among their respective species.

If, as hypothesized by Clark, et al. (1980) on the basis of flavonoid profiles, Ericameria proves to be closest to the ancestral form in this group, with Macronema and perhaps Asiris as derivatives, and if the closest relative of Macronema proves to be Chrysothamnus, strict adherence to principles of cladistic classification would necessitate the merger of Chrysothamnus with all the rest. This would be extremely difficult to justify on a pragmatic basis, however, in view of the careful and detailed morphological and anatomical investigations of Chrysothamnus by Loran Anderson, which have not suggested that it is congeneric with Macronema.

In order to clarify the boundaries of *Ericameria*, seven species have been removed as a separate, distantly related genus (Nesom, *et al.* submitted). In a correlated step, I propose to enlarge *Ericameria*, recognizing it as closely related to *Chrysothamnus*, and leaving as *Haplopappus* and its close relatives a group of species of South America (and North America if *Hazardia* is included) with the base chromosome number of x=5 (Brown & Clark 1982).

Taxonomic Summary of Ericameria

Ericameria Nutt., Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., ser. 2 7:318. 1841. TYPE SPECIES: Ericameria microphylla Nutt., nom. nov. illeg. (= E. ericoides).

As pointed out by Hall (1928), Nuttall arbitrarily adopted a new epithet ("microphylla") when he transferred the type species to the new genus Ericameria. He cited "Haplopappus ericoides (Less.) DC." as the name his new one would replace, but that combination was first made by Hooker & Arnott.

The following species are included, with partial synonymy.

150 PHYTOLOGIA

A. Ericameria sect. Ericameria

- 1. Ericameria arborescens (A. Grav) E. Greene, Man. Bot. S.F. Bay Reg. 175. 1894. Bigelovia arborescens A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 8:640. 1873. Haplopappus arborescens (A. Gray) H.M. Hall, Univ. California Publ. Bot. 7:273. 1919.
- 2. Ericameria brachylepis (A. Gray) H.M. Hall, Univ. California Publ. Bot. 3:56. 1907. Bigelovia brachylepis A. Gray, Bot. California 1:614. 1876. Haplopappus brachylepis (A. Gray) H.M. Hall, Univ. California Publ. Bot. 7:273. 1919; non Phil. Haplopappus propinguus S.F. Blake, nom. nov., Contr. U.S. Natl. Herb. 23:1490. 1926.
- 3a. Ericameria cooperi (A. Gray) H.M. Hall, Univ. California Publ. Bot. 3:56. 1907. Bigelovia cooperi A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 8:640. 1873. Haplopappus cooperi (A. Gray) H.M. Hall, Carnegie Inst. Washington, Publ. 389:275. 1928.

Ericameria monactis (A. Gray) McClatchie, Erythea 2:124. 1894. Haplopappus monactis A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 19:1. 1883.

- 3b. Ericameria cooperi var. bajacalifornica (Urbatsch & Wussow) Urbatsch, Phytologia 67:109. 1989. Ericameria cooperi subsp. bajacalifornica Urbatsch & Wussow, Brittonia 31:274. 1979.
- 4a. Ericameria cuneata (A. Gray) McClatchie, Erythea 2:124. 1894. Haplopappus cuneatus A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 8:635. 1873.
- 4b. Ericameria cuneata var. macrocephala Urbatsch, Madroño 23:344. 1976.
- 4c. Ericameria cuneata car. spathulata (A. Gray) H.M. Hall, Univ. California Publ. Bot. 3:52. 1907. Bigelovia spathulata A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 11:74. 1876. Haplopappus cuneatus var. spathulatus (A. Gray) S.F. Blake, Contr. U.S. Natl. Herb. 23:1849. 1926.
- Ericameria ericoides (Less.) Jepson, Fl. W. Mid. Calif. 559. 5. 1901. Diplopappus ericoides Less., Linnaea 6:117. 1831. Haplopappus ericoides (Less.) Hook. & Arn., Bot. Beechey Voy. 146. 1833; non DC., Prodr. 5:346. 1836. Ericameria microphylla Nutt., nom. illeg., Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., ser. 2 7:319. 1841.
- 6. Ericameria fasciculata (Eastw.) Macbr., Contr. Gray Herb. 56:36. 1918. Chrysoma fasciculata Eastw., Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 32:215. 1905. Haplopappus eastwoodae H.M. Hall, nom. nov., Carnegie Inst. Washington, Publ. 389:258. 1928.

- Ericameria juarezensis (R. Moran) Urbatsch, Phytologia 67:109. 1989. Haplopappus juarezensis R. Moran, Trans. San Diego Soc. Nat. Hist. 15:154-155. 1969.
- 8. Ericameria laricifolia (A. Gray) Shinners, Field & Lab. 18:27. 1950. Haplopappus laricifolius A. Gray, Pl. Wright. 2:80. 1853.

Ericameria nelsonii (Fernald) S.F. Blake, Contr. Gray Herb. 52:26. 1917. Bigelovia nelsonii Fernald, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 36:505. 1901.

- Ericameria martirensis Wiggins, Contr. Dudley Herb. 1:177. 1933. Aplopappus martirensis (Wiggins) S.F. Blake, Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington 48:173. 1935.
- Ericameria palmeri (A. Gray) H.M. Hall, Univ. California Publ. Bot.
 3:53. 1907. Haplopappus palmeri A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 11:74.
 1876.
- Ericameria palmeri var. pachylepis (H.M. Hall) Nesom, Phytologia 67:104. 1989. Haplopappus palmeri subsp. pachylepis H.M. Hall, Carnegie Inst. Washington, Publ. 389:267. 1928.
- 11a. Ericameria parishii (E. Greene) H.M. Hall, Univ. California Publ. Bot.
 3:55. 1907. Bigelovia parishii E. Greene, Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 9:62.
 1882. Haplopappus parishii (E. Greene) S.F. Blake, Contr. U.S. Natl.
 Herb. 23:1491. 1926.
- 11b. Ericameria parishii var. peninsularis (R. Moran) Nesom, Phytologia 67:104. 1989. Haplopappus arborescens subsp. peninsularis R. Moran, Trans. San Diego Soc. Nat. Hist. 15:152. 1969.
- Ericameria pinifolia (A. Gray) H.M. Hall, Univ. California Publ. Bot. 3:54. 1907. Haplopappus pinifolius A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 8:636. 1873.
- B. Ericameria sect. Stenotopsis (Rydb.) Urbatsch & Wussow, Brittonia 31:273. 1979. Stenotopsis Rydb., Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 23:617. 1900. TYPE SPECIES: Haplopappus linearifolius DC. (= Ericameria linearifolia [DC.] Urbatsch & Wussow). Haplopappus sect. Stenotopsis (Rydb.) H.M. Hall, Carnegie Inst. Washington, Publ. 389:156. 1928, in part.
- Ericameria linearifolia (DC.) Urbatsch & Wussow, Brittonia 31:273. 1979. Haplopappus linearifolius DC., Prodr. 5:347. 1836. Stenotus linearifolius (DC.) Torrey & A. Gray, Fl. N. Amer. 2:238. 1842. Stenotopsis linearifolius (DC.) Rydb., Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 27:617. 1900.

152 PHYTOLOGIA volume 68(2):144-155

February 1990

Haplopappus interior Coville, Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington 7:65. 1892. Haplopappus linearifolius var. interior (Coville) Jones, Proc. California Acad., ser. 2 5:697. 1895.

- C. Ericameria sect. Asiris (H.M. Hall) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Haplopappus sect. Asiris H.M. Hall, Carnegie Inst. Washington, Yearb. 25:342. 1926. TYPE SPECIES: Ericameria nana Nutt.
- 1. Ericameria cervina (S. Wats.) Rydb., Fl. Rocky Mts. 853. 1917. Haplopappus cervinus S. Wats., Amer. Naturalist 7:301. 1873.
- Ericameria nana Nutt., Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., ser. 2 7:319. 1841. Haplopappus nanus (Nutt.) D.C. Eaton, Bot. King's Expl. 159. 1871. Chrysothamnus nanus (Nutt.) J.T. Howell, Fl. N.W. Amer. 302. 1900.
- Ericameria obovata (Rydb.) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Macronema obovatum Rydb., Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 27:618. 1900. Haplopappus rydbergii S.F. Blake, nom. nov., Contr. U.S. Natl. Herb. 25:545. 1925; not Haplopappus obovatus Phil. Haplopappus watsonii var. rydbergii (S.F. Blake) S.L. Welsh, Great Basin Nat. 43:295. 1983. I have not been able to evaluate Welsh's taxonomic judgment.
- Ericameria resinosa Nutt., Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., ser. 2 7:319. 1841. Haplopappus resinosus (Nutt.) A. Gray, Bot. Calif. 1:313. 1876. Chrysothamnus resinosus (Nutt.) J.T. Howell, Fl. N.W. Amer. 303. 1900.
- Ericameria watsonii (A. Gray) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Haplopappus watsonii A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 16:79. 1881. Macronema watsonii (A. Gray) E. Greene, Erythea 2:74. 1894.
- D. Ericameria sect. Macronema (Nutt.) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Macronema Nutt., Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., ser. 2 7:322. 1841. Haplopappus sect. Macronema (Nutt.) A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 6:542. 1865. TYPE SPECIES: Ericameria suffruticosa (Nutt.) Nesom.
- Ericameria bloomeri (A. Gray) Macbr., Contr. Gray Herb. 56:36. 1918. Haplopappus bloomeri A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 6:541. 1865. Chrysothamnus bloomeri (A. Gray) E. Greene, Erythea 3:115. 1895.
 - Ericameria compacta (H.M. Hall) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Haplopappus bloomeri A. Gray subsp. compactus H.M. Hall, Carnegie Inst. Washington, Publ. 389:199. 1928. Haplopappus compactus (H.M. Hall) L.C. Anderson, Great Basin Nat. 43:358. 1983.
 - 3. Ericameria crispa (L.C. Anderson) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Haplopappus crispus L.C. Anderson, Great Basin Nat. 43:359. 1983.

- 4a. Ericameria discoidea (Nutt.) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Macronema discoidea Nutt., Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., ser. 2 7:322. 1841. Haplopappus macronema (Nutt.) A. Gray, nom. nov., Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 6:542. 1865.
- 4b. Ericameria discoidea var. linearis (Rydb.) Nesom comb. nov. BA-SIONYM: Macronema linearis Rydb., Mem. New York Bot. Gard. 1:384. 1900. Haplopappus macronema (Nutt.) A. Gray var. linearis (Rydb.) Dorn, Vascular Plants of Wyoming 295. 1988.
- Ericameria gilmanii (S.F. Blake) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Haplopappus gilmanii S.F. Blake, Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington 52:97. 1939.
- Ericameria greenei (A. Gray) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Haplopappus greenei A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 16:80. 1880. Macronema greenei (A. Gray) E. Greene, Erythea 2:73. 1894.
- Fricameria ophitidis (J.T. Howell) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Haplopappus bloomeri var. ophitidis J.T. Howell, Leaflets West. Bot. 6:85. 1950. Haplopappus ophitidis (J.T. Howell) Keck, Aliso 4:103. 1958.
- Ericameria suffruticosa (Nutt.) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Macronema suffruticosa Nutt., Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., ser. 2 7:322.
 1841. Haplopappus suffruticosus (Nutt.) A. Gray, Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts 6:542. 1865.
- Ericameria zionis (L.C. Anderson) Nesom, comb. nov. BASIONYM: Haplopappus zionis L.C. Anderson, Great Basin Nat. 43:360. 1983.

Species Excluded

The following species will be treated as a separate genus (Nesom, et al. submitted).

Ericameria austrotexana M.C. Johnston

Ericameria diffusa Benth.

Ericameria parrasana S.F. Blake

Ericameria pseudobaccharis (S.F. Blake) Urbatsch

Ericameria purpusii Brandegee

Ericameria riskindii Turner & Langford

volume 68(2):144-155

Ericameria triantha (S.F. Blake) Shinners

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Dr. B.L. Turner and David Morgan for their review and comments on the manuscript.

LITERATURE CITED

Anderson, L.C. 1963. Studies on *Petradoria* (Compositae): anatomy, cytology, taxonomy. Trans. Kansas Acad. Sci. 66:632-684.

____. 1970. Floral anatomy of Chrysothamnus (Astereae, Compositae). Sida 3:466-503.

____. 1983. Chrysothamnus eremobius (Asteraceae): a new species from Nevada. Brittonia 35:23-27.

_____. 1984. An overview of the genus Chrysothamnus (Asteraceae). Pp. 29-45 in Proceedings – Symposium on the biology of Artemisia and Chrysothamnus. Provo, Utah.

____ & J.L. Reveal. 1966. Chrysothamnus bolanderi, an intergeneric hybrid. Madroño 18:225-233.

- Anderson, L.C. & J.B. Creech. 1975. Comparative leaf anatomy of Solidago and related Asteraceae. Amer. J. Bot. 62:486-493.
- Blake, S.F. 1926. Compositae in: Trees and Shrubs of Mexico. Contr. U.S. Natl. Herb. 23:1401-1641.
- Brown, G.K. & W.D. Clark. 1982. Taxonomy of Haplopappus sect. Gymnocoma (Compositae). Syst. Bot. 7:199-213.
- Clark, W.D., L.E. Urbatsch, R.L. Hartman, R.A. Mayes & T.J. Mabry. 1980. Systematic implications of flavonoid patterns in *Haplopappus* segregates. Biochem. Syst. Ecol. 8:257-259.
- Cody, M.L. & H.J. Thompson. 1986. Distribution and morphology of Haplopappus hybrids (Asteraceae: Astereae) in the Mojave Desert. Madroño 33:237-243.

Taxonomic summary of Ericameria

- Cronquist, A. 1973. Compositae. Pp. 461-557 in C.L. Hitchcock & A. Cronquist, Flora of the Pacific Northwest. Univ. Washington Press, Seattle.
- Ferris, R.S. 1960. Compositae. Pp. 98-613 in L. Abrams, Ill. Fl. Pacific States, vol. IV. Stanford Univ. Press, Stanford, California.
- Hall, H.M. 1928. Sect. Ericameria in The genus Haplopappus—A phylogenetic study in the Compositae. Carnegie Inst. Washington, Publ. 389:258-288.
 - _____ & F.E. Clements. 1923. The phylogenetic method in taxonomy: The North American species of Artemisia, Chrysothamnus, and Atriplex. Carnegie Inst. Washington, Publ. 326:1-355.
- Johnston, M.C. 1970. Ericameria. Pp. 1577-1578 in D.S. Correll & M.C. Johnston. Manual of the Vascular Plants of Texas. Texas Research Foundation, Renner, Texas.
- Kartesz, J.T. & R. Kartesz. 1980. Checklist of the Vascular Plants of North America. Univ. North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Macbride, J.F. 1918. Reclassified or new Compositae, chiefly North American Helenieae. Contr. Gray Herb. 56:36-50.
- Nesom, G.L. 1989. A new combination in *Stenotus* (Compositae: Astereae). Phytologia 67:113-114.

_____ & D.R. Morgan. Submitted. Reinstatement of *Tonestus* (Asteraceae: Astereae). Phytologia.

____, Y. Suh, D. Morgan & B.B. Simpson. Submitted. Xylothamia (Asteraceae: Astereae), a new genus related to Euthamia. Sida.

Urbatsch, L.E. 1975. First chromosome number reports for some Compositae. Southw. Naturalist 19:283-285.

____. 1976. Systematics of the Ericameria cuneata complex (Compositae, Astereae). Madroño 23:338-345.

_____. 1978. The Chihuahuan Desert species of Ericameria (Compositae: Astereae). Sida 7:298-303.

____ & J.R. Wussow. 1979. The taxonomic affinities of Haplopappus linearifolius (Asteraceae-Astereae). Brittonia 31:265-275.

Nesom:



Nesom, Guy L. 1990. "Taxonomic summary of Ericameria (Asteraceae: Astereae), with the inclusion of Haplopappus sects. Macronema and Asiris." *Phytologia* 68, 144–155. <u>https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.19468</u>.

View This Item Online: https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.19468 Permalink: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/19468

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: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder. Rights Holder: Phytologia License: <u>http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/</u> Rights: <u>https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions</u>

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.