

copy

Note on some German
Plants, by the William Dawson
H.D. 718

Lobelia in a recent number
of the Berlin Proceedings certain
remarks of Dr Weip and the
Journals therein ^{concerning} to ^{be} ^{substantially} ~~which~~
tending to introduce great an-
gular into the nomenclature
of ^{some} German plants, which though
very well known in Canada
seem to be by perfectly known
of these German palaeobotanists.
On these points I would advise to
make the following note:—

1 *Drepanophycus spinulosus* of Schimper
has long been known to me from
its name and description, and
I have supposed that when better
^{material could be obtained}
known it would be found to
belong to my genus *Arthrostroma*

the outline
with ~~the outline~~ of which, ^{when compared,} it agrees,
Arthrocladus differs from Perlophyton
not only in its more robust
habit of growth and much
larger leaves, but in the
proliferation about the ends
of a spike of rounded & prostrate
quite different from the prostrate
features of Perlophyton. ^{which I have described in previous papers.*} Should
Drepanophycus be found to be a
Candel plant it should at
least until its prostrate
is known be referred to
Arthrocladus.

I must refer also to
Dr. Wess's idea of ^{parts} ~~parts~~ of
several names. Drepanophycus
is no doubt older than either Arthrocladus =
* See ^{2^d} Report of our German Plants of Canada 1882

Stigma or Perlephyton but it
is quite inappropriate and
if it is proposed to replace it
by Depanphyton. Well then that
genus must date from 1889
not from 1852. I think it
very likely that some at least
of the plants figured by Jaegle
as Halimites Dechenmanns are
unusually preserved fragments
of Perlephyton, but the name
also is inappropriate and
cannot be applied to land
plants even if my Cycadea
should prove to be well founded.

2. Perlephyton rotundum. The
Cycadea of ^{von} Solms = ^{Laubach} there this is seen.

Call distinct from P. princeps and
that it may be fern & stone
cannot be maintained in
presence of the large and
perfect specimens obtained
from Campbeltown and
about. I have not yet
been able to figure. Besides
the prothallium of P. princeps is
well known, ^{and has been described,} and while
apparently distinct from that
of P. princeps it shows a
general affinity.

Weip 3 I quite agree with Dr
^{described & figured} that many of the forms
of stone from the Silurian of
Bohemia must belong to
Pulephyton, I have any held

The Journal, but not the Journal
has been to the Journal
of the Journal, but not the Journal
of the Journal, but not the Journal

John
DeKamphuis