The first who collected *Centaurodendron* was not JOHOW, but BERTERO; still, B. did not discover it. Under the name of *Dendroseris micrantha*, BERTERO no. 1602! (Herb. Kew) there is one sheet with pieces of an old inflorescence of the latter together with a leaf of *Centaurodendron*.

JOHOW discovered this in July, 1892, and found it again in June, 1895; to judge from a specimen in his herbarium it was also gathered by SÖHRENS, probably in April, 1895, on the same occasion when S. found *Robinsonia thurifera*, for it lies together with this under the same name. I rediscovered it in August, 1908, and found the old inflorescence, just as JOHOW did, but there was no trace of new ones. From this I concluded that it flowers late in the summer or even in the autumn, and I expected to get flowers this time, but was cruelly deceived. For all I could do was to state that in certain years not a single specimen produces flowers, and that the year 1916—17 was one of them.

Area of distribution: Endemic in Masatierra; monotypic.

Dendroseris D. Don.

The type of the genus is *D. macrophylla* D. Don, Phil. Mag. XI (1832) 388, collected in Masafuera by Cuming (Herb. Kew!). One year later DECAISNE, in Arch. de Bot. I (1833) 513, described the genus *Rea* Bert. ms., with the following species: *R. macrantha* Bert. et Done (Masatierra), *Berteriana* Done (Masatierra), *pinnata* Bert. et Done (Masatierra), *neriifolia* Done (Masatierra), *micrantha* Bert. et Done (Masatierra), *marginata* Bert. et Done (Masatierra: Portezuelo), *mollis* Bert. et Done (Masatierra: Portezuelo). In Comp. Bot. Mag. I. 32 HOOKER and ARNOTT reduced *Rea* to *Dendroseris*, listing the following species: *D. macrophylla* (with R. macrantha as syn.), *Berteriana*, *pinnata*, *neriifolia*, *micrantha*, *marginata* and *mollis*.

JOHOW, Estud., reduced these seven species to four, declaring D. Berteriana identical with pinnata and marginata with macrophylla and rejecting D. mollis altogether. Of this, only the leaves, described as "subincano-velutina" — glabrous in all the others — are known. There is no specimen in Kew, nor in Paris, and I have not been able to discover the type. JOHOW guessed that a stout specimen of Gnaphalium citrinum (= cheiranthifolium) or some other similar plant was mistaken for Dendroseris. This is hardly probable. In the locality given, Portezuelo, nothing like it is found, unless a young Robinsonia or Rhetinodendron was mistaken for a Dendroseris. With regard to BERTERO's ability as an observer, this is difficult to believe.

The treatment of *Dendroseris* in Johow's flora is not quite satisfactory; still, he is not to blame. He had no opportunity to see Bertero's types, his own material was scarce; further, when Hooker and Arnott reduced *Rea macrantha* to *D. macrophylla* they indicated the wrong course later followed by Gay and Johow. Hemsley pointed out the validity of *D. marginata*, but Johow brought this to *macrophylla*. He was equally critical against his own discoveries, for the peculiar *micrantha* from the coast rocks was only with hesitation classified even as a variety, v. *pruinata*. In the case of *D. Berteriana*,

- II. Head smaller. Flowers whitish. Achenes not winged.
 - A. Stem simple, hollow. Receptacle fibrillose. Leaves pinnate.

Subgen. II. Phoenicoseris Skottsb.

- 1. Pinnae deeply bifurcate with linear segments.
 - D. pinnata (Bert. et Done) Hook. et Arn.
- 2. Pinnae ± ovate, dentate.
 - a. Petiole winged, but not auriculate.
 - D. pinnata var. insignis (Bert.).
 - b. Petiole auriculate. D. regia Skottsb.
- B. Stem branched, solid. Receptacle naked. Leaves entire.

Subgen. III. Rea (Bert. ex p.) Skottsb.

1. Leaf-margin minutely denticulate or entire. Ligule 5-dentate.

Sect. I. Eurea Skottsb.

- a. Leaves petiolate. Involucre funnel-shaped, c. 5 mm high.
 - +. Leaves coriaceous, narrow lanceolate.

D. neviifolia (Done) Hook. et Arn.

++. Leaves chartaceous, ovate-lanceolate.

D. micrantha (Bert. et Done) Hook. et Arn.

b. Leaves sessile. Involucre campanulate, c. 10 mm high.

D. pruinata (Joh.) Skottsb.

2. Leaves densely dentate-serrate, very thin. Ligules deeply 5-cleft. Sect. 2. Schizoglossum Skottsb. D. gigantea Joh.

BENTHAM and HOOKER FIL., Gen. plant. II. 219, describe the achene of the Dendroseriidae in the following terms: »Achaenia a dorso compressa subtrigona v. 2—3-alata». This description fits the genus Fitchia, a genus not very near Dendroseris. The achene of Thamnoseris is unknown. The marginal achenes of Dendroseris are more or less compressed from the back, triangular in section, with two lateral and sometimes also with a ventral wing in Eudendroseris. But all the other achaenia in the head are compressed from the sides, and their wings in Eudendroseris are dorsal and ventral only. This dimorphism clearly stands in relation with the different position in the head. It is illustrated below, fig. 37.

133. **D. macrophylla** D. Don. — Johow, Estud. 70 p. p. min. — Fig. 37 a, m.

Masafuera: Cuming! Downton! — On the walls of the canyons, also higher up on the ridges and on the top of the lofty coast cliffs in some places, scattered. Ravines above Q. Sanchez, solitary specimens; Q. de las Casas, rock ledges (fl. ²³/₂ 17, no. 362; also observed by Johow); Q. de las Vacas (also Johow); Q. Inocentes, some large trees on the cliffs c. 500 m; Q. Angosta, in the narrow gorge; Rodado del Sándalo, on the top of the cliff; Q. de la Lobería, some fine trees, c. 250 m.

There is a good illustration of this species in CURTIS, Bot. Mag. t. 6353. The specimens growing in the fissures on the canyon walls are small and seldom more than 2 or 3 m high; in more suitable places there are much larger ones, at least 5 or 6 m high and with a trunk 15 or perhaps 20 cm thick, so