

**CANARIUM SECT. AFRICANARIUM NOV. SECT.  
(BURSERACEAE)**

P. W. LEENHOUTS

In my revision of the genus *Canarium* (Blumea 9, 1959, p. 275—475), *C. schweinfurthii* was included in sect. *Canarium* and within this section in the *denticulatum*-group (see p. 382). The main arguments for giving it that position were: 1. its general resemblance in several characters with sect. *Canarium*, more specially the apparent morphological equality of its stipules, a key character in the genus; 2. its apparent relationship to *C. madagascariense* Engl. the inclusion of which in the *denticulatum*-group is beyond any doubt, and, 3., its geographical position at the end of the chain of species forming the *denticulatum*-group — from W. Malesia to E. Africa, *C. schweinfurthii* being restricted to W. and Central Africa — without any connection to other groups of the genus (sect. *Pimela* does not go farther to the west than the Malabar coast of India). Still, it was not without doubt that I put it into this position. I expressed my doubts most clearly on p. 314—315, pointing to the presence on the one hand of some apparently primitive characters — in fact more primitive than could be expected in case of a direct derivation from the western chain of species of the *denticulatum*-group — as e.g. the axillary inflorescence and the presence of a rather strongly developed pistillode in the ♂ flower, of some doubtless highly evolved characters on the other hand, like the deeply concave receptacle in the ♀ flower and the 'androphore' in the ♂ one. Hence I concluded that the species 'must have been isolated for a very long time'.

Recently, morphological and blastogenetical studies brought new evidence as to the systematic position of *C. schweinfurthii*. From both it became quite clear, that the 'stipules' are not at all comparable with those of sect. *Canarium*, but are homologous with the pseudo-stipules of sect. *Pimela*; there is no doubt that they are derived from a pair of leaflets. The germination, however, which seems to provide good characters on sectional level in *Canarium*, differed from both sect. *Canarium* and sect. *Pimela*: the cotyledons were herbaceous long-lasting assimilating-organs like in sect. *Pimela*, but the first two leaves formed a pair of opposite pseudo-cotyledons like in sect. *Canarium*, and the resting-period came after the unfolding of the latter two, also like in sect. *Canarium*. A more detailed discussion of these morphological points will be given elsewhere (Weberling & Leenhouts, in press).

These new facts, together with the unique characters already known — especially the strongly developed tongue-shaped 'stipules' in the later leaves and the androphorous-like developed disk in the ♂ flower — persuaded me to reconsider the systematic position of *C. schweinfurthii*. My conclusion is that it was wrongly included in sect. *Canarium*, that it can not be included in sect. *Pimela* either — the 3rd section, *Canariellum*, deserves no consideration at all —, but that the only reasonable solution will be to make it the type of a new section which I propose to name *Africanarium*.

**Canarium sect. Africanarium** Leenh., nov. sect.

Foliola infima stipuliformia in petiolo 1½—5 cm supra basin inserta, oblongo-spathulata vel linguiformia, in foliis primis compluribus plantae juvenilis absentia. Inflorescentiae axillares. Stamina in flore masculino complete disco elongato adnata. Receptaculum in flore femineo concavum. Cotyledones persistentes, herbacei; folia duo prima opposita, simplicia.

Species typica: *C. schweinfurthii* Engl.