

MISCELLANEOUS BOTANICAL NOTES XV

C. G. G. J. VAN STEENIS

101. THE IDENTITY OF WEIGELIA FALLAX MIQUEL (CAPRIFOLIACEAE) *

In our revision of *Caprifoliaceae* in Fl. Mal. I, 4 (1951) 175 *seq.* we omitted to mention *Weigelia fallax* described by Miquel from Lembang, West Java, collected by Korthals. The specimen was concealed among cultivated specimens and turned up recently. There is no doubt that this specimen is derived from an ornamental in the Javanese hills.

We have sent this material to Prof. Hara who found it conspecific with *Weigelia coraensis* Thunb. It is often cultivated in Japan, especially as a hedge plant.

At Leyden there is also a sheet from specimens cultivated in the Botanic Gardens; Bogor, probably cultivated in the Tjibodas mountain garden in the former century.

Weigelia coraensis Thunb. Trans. Linn. Soc. 2 (1794) 331; Hara, Enum. Sperm. Jap. 2 (1952) 63. — *Weigelia fallax* Miq. Fl. Ind. Bat. 2 (1856) 128. — *Diervilla fallax* (Miq.) Boerl. Handl. Fl. Ned. Ind. 2 (1891) 6.

Among the material from Java, sent to Prof. Hara, was also a sterile sheet which is probably *W. japonica* Thunb. This species is native in Kyushyu, but is rare in cultivation. It was mentioned to be cultivated at Bogor by Hasskarl, Cat. Hort. Bog. (1844) 116. In Teysmann and Binnendijk's Catalogue of 1866 two other *Diervilla* names were mentioned, but cultivation was apparently unsuccessful and from the catalogue by Dakkus (1930) the genus is absent.

102. THE IDENTITY OF HOLOSTEUM HIRSUTUM L. (AIZOACEAE)

In Index Kewensis this species, described from India ('Malabaria') is not reduced and it is not mentioned in the index of Hooker's Flora of British India. Scanning the complicated text of some papers by Hallier *f.* revealed that he had found the holotype specimen in the Rijksherbarium and reduced it to *Mollugo hirta* Thunb. without realizing that Linnaeus's epithet is much older than Thunberg's. In most recent literature the genus *Glinus* is recognized alongside *Mollugo*, and *Mollugo hirta* Thunb. is reduced to *Glinus lotoides* L. It seems therefore important to reduce *Holosteum hirsutum* L. officially to prohibit that its epithet *hirsutum* would get precedence over *lotoides*. Thus the synonymy becomes:

Glinus lotoides L. Sp. Pl. (1753) 463; Backer, Fl. Mal. I, 4 (1953) 269. — *Holosteum hirsutum* L. Sp. Pl. (1753) 88. — Holotype: *Hb Van Royen ex Malabaricae* in L, sh. 899, 143—553.

*) This note is based on data provided by Prof. Dr. H. Hara, Botanical Institute, Faculty of Science, University of Tokyo, Japan.

103. THE TYPIFICATION OF THE GENUS RHAPHIDOPHORA HASSK. (ARACEAE)

In Bailey 10 (1962) 23—29 Bunting discussed the typification of the Araceous genus *Rhaphidophora* Hassk. Recently Furtado disagreed and considered his conclusion in a more general essay on typification of genera in Taxon 13 (1964) 237—245. Though I share Furtado's view I find a further concise comment desirable.

In 1842 Hasskarl published two papers on plants which he had observed in West Java and which were grown in the Botanic Garden at Bogor; they were precursors to his Catalogue of this garden which appeared in 1844.

One paper concerned more lengthy, detailed descriptions made from the living plant. This was in van der Hoeven & de Vriese (ed.), Tijdschr. Nat. Geschied. & Phys. 9 (1842) in which he incorporated the description of *Rhaphidophora lacera* Hassk. n.g., n.sp. on pages 168—169, a Javanese plant of which he also gave the vernacular name.

In the 'synonymy' of it he mentioned '*An Pothos pertusus* Roxb. I. 455?'. The question mark indubitably indicates that he was not certain of this synonym and this suggestion of Hasskarl's has of course here no nomenclatural consequence.

The second paper was of a more concise nature; in this he briefly enumerated many names with brief descriptions or notes. This was in Flora 25, 2 (1842) Beibl. 1, where he again incorporated *Rhaphidophora lacera* Hassk. on p. 11. He annotated this in giving the differences between his new genus by contrasting its characters with those of *Calla*, *Monstera*, and *Scindapsus*. Here he added *Pothos pertusa* as a synonym without question mark, adding again the vernacular Javanese name. See also Birdsey (Bailey l.c. p. 159, footnote).

In both papers the genus is monotypic and the descriptions, one long and one short, must be regarded as generico-specific *. They refer to the same Javanese plant and although not containing cross-references, they cannot be divorced. It is probable that the first mentioned paper was written earlier than the second but this is immaterial. One can only guess at the reason why Hasskarl quoted the synonym as *clearly tentative* with the first elaborate description and omitted this in the concise second one. The fact is that he omitted also the question mark in the Catalogue (1844) p. 58 and in the very lengthy description in his Pl. Jav. Rar. (1848) 155—158. As the Rules in a general way prescribe the logic of 'following the intention of the author' I conclude that he was really convinced that he had the same plant in hand as Roxburgh, although he could judge only from Roxburgh's description in Fl. Ind. 1 (1820) 455. From this follows again that the epithet *lacera* is illegitimate; Hasskarl should have taken up *pertusa*. Moreover, Hasskarl's second paper was published in July 1842 and his first in Aug. or Sept. 1842 (cf. Fl. Mal. Bull. 18, 1963, 1015) so that a discussion about the value of the question mark is unnecessary; in the first published publication and two later ones there is no question mark.

Bunting was obviously most annoyed by the fact that both Hasskarl and Roxburgh did not 'cite' type specimens; Dr Bunting will find this very frequent in old literature. If descriptions were made from garden specimens — frequently plants from nature transferred to gardens — authors made descriptions from the living plant and omitted to make herbarium, in order not to destroy their living plant. In this case there is obviously no authentic material of Hasskarl; but Furtado pointed out that a figure of *Pothos pertusa* Roxb. is found in Wight's Icones Pl. Ind. Or. 3 (1844) t. 781.

*) Bunting (Bailey 10, 1962, 25) erroneously concluded that Hasskarl only provided a description of the genus.

The type species of *Rhaphidophora* is indubitably *R. lacera* Hassk., a Javanese plant. That its epithet is illegitimate is nomenclaturally irrelevant. The correct name of *R. lacera* is *R. pinnata* (L.) Schott.

As to *Pothos pertusa* Roxb., this was certainly based on plant specimens of which the identity must be established from Wight's plate. The epithet is illegitimate as Roxburgh quoted Rheede's Hort. Mal. 12: 41, t. 20—21. This is the type of *Polypodium laciniatum* Burm. f. Fl. Ind. (1768) 231, the correct name of which is *Rhaphidophora laciniata* (Burm. f.) Merr. 1921.

I may add that I strongly object against the first conclusion of Furtado, *l.c.* p. 245, reading: 'In actual practice the nomenclatural type of a genus is a specimen'. I find this faulty, both practical and theoretical, and against the Rules. The type of a species is a specimen, the type of a genus is a species. As typification runs through the hierarchy one might, following Furtado's view, come to the erratic conclusion that even the type of an order is 'in actual practice' a specimen.