

VII. DATES OF PUBLICATION OF MALAYSIAN PHYTOTAXONOMICAL
LITERATURE (cntd. from p.49).

Blume, C.L. Museum Botanicum. 2 volumes.

The dates given by BLUME for each separate part of volume 1 (1849-1851) seem always to have been considered to be correct.

However, those of the 2nd volume are partly wrong: the preface is dated 1852, and may have been printed at that time, but the book was then not distributed. Each part consists of 16 pages.

Part 1 of vol.2, including title-page and preface, bears the date 1852 on page 5, whereas parts 2-8 are not provided with a date, the 9th on its last page (p.144) is dated Nov. 1855, and onwards each part, up till the last, no 16, is dated a month later.

According to O.KUNTZE (Rev.Gen.1, p.CXXIV) BENTHAM noted in the Kew copy that "he saw 7 or 8 parts of Mus.Bot.vol.2 at BLUME's in 1853; but none were published until 1856".

A rather sharp article by MIQUEL (Bot.Zeit.14 (1846) 185-188) bears the same testimony; he states that parts 1-8 (pp.1-128) were available Febr.1856, though he had seen them (inedited) at BLUME's earlier (cf.also Fl.Ind.Bat.I, 1, p.1084). Parts 9-12 were according to MIQUEL (Bot.Zeit. 14 (1856) 540, 541) distributed in the middle of May 1856.

A third source is WEDDELL's monograph on the Urticaceae (in Mém.Mus.Paris 1856). He received the separate parts of the Mus.Bot.vol.2 when his own work was in the press. He states to have received parts 1-12 by June 1856 (l.c.p.48,90). In the appendix (l.c.p.588) he noted that he had at that time also parts 14-16 (the last ones published). Unfortunately WEDDELL does not mention the precise month of 1856 in which his own work was finished. The citations of WEDDELL are clearly elucidated by Prof. HOCHREUTINER (in Candollea 2, p. 23).

It is clear that though the parts were dated one every month, they were distributed, not in separate parts, but in lots.

PRITZEL (Thes.p.29) mentions 1856 as the year of publication of Mus.Bot.vol.2.

It seems that the dates of effective publication of volume 2 are:

parts 1-8, pp.1-128. Febr.1856. Part 13, pp.193-208,..?
..1856.
parts 9-12, pp.129-192. May, 1856. parts 14-16, pp.209-256...?
..1856.

Wageningen, March 1948.

J.G.B.Beumée.

T e y s m a n n, J.E. & S. B i n n e n d i j k, Catalogus van 's-Lands Plantentuin te Buitenzorg, inedita 1854. (not: 1855). Cf. D.F.van Slooten, Bull.Jard.Bot.Btzg.III, 6 (1924) 32-33 and C.G.G.J.van Steenis, Bull.Jard.Bot.Btzg.III, 13 (1933) 117-119).

To the exposition of facts of this book several important things can be added. In the first place Messrs H.K. Airy Shaw and Mr Marshall, of the Roy.Botanic Gardens, Kew, state that no copy is present in the Kew Library, so that only 2 copies of this work are located, both for official use in the Gardens at Buitenzorg. Dr De Wit informed me, that James Motley who was in 1855 in Java used the Catalogue during his stay in Java (cf.Hook.Journ.Bot.& Kew Gard.Misc.7 (1856) 78-81). Further Dr Beumée informed me (March 1940) that during the clearing of some old parcels received at Wageningen from Buitenzorg he found some printed sheets of the catalogue used as wrappers. Treub (Gedenkboek... 's-Lands Plantentuin te Buitenzorg, 1892, p.27) who used most probably official sources in his compilation gives no special reason for the suppressing of the edition other than: "the task for the compilation (by Binnendijk) of the new catalogue appeared too difficult; the catalogue was printed (in the 1st half of 1854) but was suppressed as it appeared that it was not fit for that aim." "To whom" it appeared unfit is not mentioned by Treub. Furtado's suggestion is that it had something to do with the contemporaneous edition of Miquel's Flora Indiae Batavae.

The publishing instance suppressed it, and the authors themselves do not make mention either of the book or the new species proposed in the book, in their later publications. It is clear that they had not the intention to regard the book as having been published.

If that is admitted, the proposed new species are not validly published according to art.37 of the International Rules of Nomenclature. This seems a very welcome solution for the highly undesirable recognition of the 59 neglected new specific names which would de-stabilize nomenclature even in the American flora.