

THE IDENTITY OF EUTHALES FILIFORMIS DE VRIESE FROM WESTERN AUSTRALIA

J. H. KERN

Euthales filiformis de Vriese (7) was described from a specimen collected in Western Australia 'in solo sublimoso fertili prope praedium rusticum Dom. Marell, York d. 30 m. Martii 1840. Herb. Preiss No. 1889.' As appears from the original description de Vriese himself had already his doubts about its belonging to *Euthales*, a Goodeniaceous genus: 'dichotoma, filiformis; foliis radicalibus squamaeformibus, caulibus ramisque aphyllis; calycibus 5-fidis, subaequalibus (Caetera non vidi). Habitus *Junci bufonii*, sed genus dubium.' In a later publication of de Vriese (8) the calyx is said to be trifold, but this is obviously a printing error.

It is a matter of course that Bentham (2), who had not seen the plant, was unable to recognize it from this very inadequate diagnosis, and supposed that it might belong to some quite different genus. On what grounds the Index Kewensis (4) referred *Euthales filiformis* to the synonymy of *Velleia trinervis* (R.Br.) Labill. (= *Euthales trinervis* R. Br.), with which species it certainly has nothing to do, is unknown to me. There is a short note on *Euthales filiformis* in Krause's monograph on the Goodeniaceae (5), which gives nothing new as it simply goes back to Bentham's observation, but apart from this I have not found de Vriese's species mentioned in more recent literature. Its name is not accounted for in Gardner's enumeration of West Australian plants (3).

The holotype of the species, annotated by de Vriese, is in the Rijksherbarium (Herb. Lugd. Bat. sh. 909.62-546). The specimen is well-preserved, but has no flowers and is so over-ripe that all the seeds have fallen out of the numerous dehisced capsules, and the leaves are almost decayed.

There is no question of its belonging to *Goodeniaceae*; it is a *Caryophyllacea*, and careful study has shown that it belongs to *Stellaria filiformis* (Benth.) Mattf., a species widely spread in temperate Australia, and originally described as *Drymaria filiformis* Benth. (1). Mattfeld (6) has shown that it is a true *Stellaria* in all characters, and that none of the features characteristic of *Drymaria* are found in it.

Although *Euthales filiformis* de Vriese appears to be the earliest legitimate name of the species, its correct name remains *Stellaria filiformis* (Benth.) Mattf., as both de Vriese and Bentham chose the significant specific epithet *filiformis* for it and consequently that of de Vriese is not transferable.

REFERENCES

1. BENTHAM, G. 1863. *Flora Australiensis* 1: 162.
2. BENTHAM, G. 1868. *Flora Australiensis* 4: 48.
3. GARDNER, C. A. 1931. *Enumeratio Plantarum Australiae Occidentalis*.
4. JACKSON, B. D. 1895. *Index Kewensis* 1: 936.
5. KRAUSE, K. 1912. in *Pflanzenreich*, Heft 54: 40.
6. MATTFELD, J. 1938. in *Fedde, Repertorium, Beih. C.*: 148.
7. VRIESE, G. H. DE, 1845. in *Lehmann, Plantae Preissianae* 1: 414.
8. VRIESE, G. H. DE, 1854. *Goodenovieae*: 171.