## **REVISION OF THE GENUS REBUTIA**

Additional Note

by A. F. BUINING and J. D. DONALD

Since the preparation of these notes two further 'rebutias' have been described by Professor M. Cardenas. Studies on these plants again suggest to us that they also more properly belong to Sulcorebutia Backbg. rather than Rebutia K.Sch. sensu strictu, accordingly we propose the following new combinations:

Sulcorebutia glomerispina (Card.) Buin. et Don. comb. nov. Syn. Rebutia glomerispina Cardenas in C et S. J. Amer. 36 (1964); 40-41.

Sulcorebutia tunariensis (Card.) Buin. et Don. comb. nov. Syn. Rebutia tunariensis Cardenas in C. et S. J. Amer. 36 (1964); 38-40.

We appreciate the remarks made by Professor Cardenas in the Cactus and Succulent Journal of America, (36 (1964), p. 39,) concerning the proper place of Sulcorebutia, but it is our firm conviction that the resemblances to Rebutia are superficial only and do not represent a true affinity, but are more a case of parallel evolution. As far as we know no fertile hybrids of Rebutia and Sulcorebutia have been raised. Fruit and seed may be formed by such crossings but the seedlings if germination occurs rapidly succumb to chlorosis. On the other hand Sulcorebutia readily form hybrids with Weingartia and Gymnocalycium and also with Chamaecereus. Rebutias, as far as we know, do not form hybrids with plants of these genera. The Chamaecereus-Sulcorebutia hybrids formed from crossing Sulcorebutia tiraquensis  $\mathcal{J}$  with Chamaecereus silvestrii  $\mathcal{Q}$  are very beautiful plants indeed.

The fruits and seeds of Sulcorebutia are far closer in all respects to those of Weingartia and some Gymnocalycium. If Sulcorebutia needs to be submerged within a more embracing genus, then we suggest Weingartia or with the latter into Gymnocalcium would be more appropriate than Rebutia.

> Originally published in the Cactus & Succulent Journal of Great Britain in November 1965 27(4) (p. 80) Reproduced with the permission of the author and/or of the publisher