SAN CRISTOBAL: ultrabasic hill east of Wainoni, 1400–1600 ft. alt., 10 Aug. 1965, G. Dennis R. S. S. 53 (BH, holotype).

Material of the holotype is incomplete

but clearly represents a taxon distinct from the other two species of *Drymoph-loeus* known from the Solomon Islands. The three species may be distinguished as follows.

- 1. Pinnae not lepidote below except for membranous scales on the midnerve; staminate flowers large, 10-12 mm. long with 190-327 stamens and ovoid or subglobose, trifid pistillode; fruit broadest at or above the middle.
 - 2. Fruit broadly ellipsoid, 1.9-2.0 cm. long; flowers subdistichously arranged along slender rachillae 3-4 mm. in diam.; staminate flowers with ca. 190 stamens. Santa Ysabel
 - 2. Fruit obovoid, 2.4–2.5 cm. long; flowers spirally arranged along thick rachillae 6–8 mm. in diam.; staminate flowers with 290–327 stamens. San Cristobal. ______ D. pachycladus

Drymophloeus litigiosus (Beccari) H. E. Moore, tr. nov.

Ptychosperma litigiosum Beccari, Malesia, 1:50. 1877 ('litigiosa').

Coleospadix litigiosa (Beccari) Beccari, Ann. Jard. Bot. Buitenzorg 2:90. 1885.

Drymophloeus oninensis (Beccari) H. E. Moore, tr. nov.

Ptychosperma litigiosum var. oninense Beccari, Malesia 1:52. 1877 ('oninensis'). Coleospadix oninensis (Beccari) Beccari, Ann. Jard. Bot. Buitenzorg 2: 90. 1885.

Drymophloeus pachycladus (Burret) H. E. Moore, tr. nov.

Rehderophoenix pachyclada Burret, Notizbl. Bot. Gart. Berlin 13:87. 1936.

Drymophloeus subdistichus (H. E. Moore) H. E. Moore, tr. nov.

Rehderophoenix subdisticha H. E. Moore, Principes 10:93. 1966.

PALM LITERATURE

(Continued from page 66)

revision in 1930 and who described many species afterward. This conservatism is all to the good when based on careful observation and has resulted in the recognition of only 75 species of *Geonoma*.

Unfortunately, conservatism at the generic level in *Calyptrogyne* has brought about an odd situation, one in which the description of the staminodial tube as digitately lobed applies only to

the subgenus *Pholidostachys* but not to subgenus *Calyptrogyne* nor to subgenus *Calyptronoma*. The reviewer is not convinced that *Calyptrogyne*, *Calyptronoma*, and *Pholidostachys* are not acceptable though related genera. Species descriptions too often fail to agree in detail with specimens which were cited as having been examined, suggesting lack of care in preparation. A more detailed review has recently appeared in *Taxon* 18: 230–232, 1969.

H. E. Moore, Jr.