NOTES ON THE FLORA OF JAVA. V.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE NEW SPECIES AND COMBINATIONS PROPOSED BY C. P. THUNBERG IN THE FLORULA JAVANICA BY L. WINBERG AND F. O. WIDMARK (1825)

by

C. A. BACKER, R. C. BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK Jr and C. G. G. J. VAN STEENIS.

Though the new names published in Thunberg's "Florula" have been entered in the Index Kewensis, few botanists have tried to verify the status and synonymy of the new species proposed in this 2-thesis booklet. Thunberg's names were entered in Juel's "Plantae Thunbergianae" (1918, 412 pp.).

The diagnoses are generally too short and vague to allow a definite opinion. Only Schott, Mueller Arg., and F. E. Wimmer have examined

material of resp. the Araceae, Euphorbiaceae, Campanulaceae.

The booklet contains descriptions of 41 species. Of these 21 were proposed as new and were no homonyms. The type specimens of these new species which are, in general, well-preserved and complete were put at our disposal by the kind co-operation of Dr H. Nannfeldt, Director of the University Institute for Systematic Botany at Uppsala. The assistant-botanist Dr Carl G. Alm informed us that 2 species could not be uncarthed, and also were not mentioned in Thunberg's eatalogue, written 1820, viz: Cyperus uniflorus Thunb. and Passerina javanica Thunb.

It appears that nearly all species could be very easily identified: of the 21 new species 2 could not be examined, 5 had been reduced earlier, 13 are reduced in this paper, and 1 is a doubtful name (Pandanus). In 3 other cases Thunberg's epithets proved to be the correct ones under the Rules. Accordingly 3 new combinations have been proposed. A few species, which were not collected in Java, presented some difficulties as appeared from the notes on the back of the sheets written by Bergius: Pandanus odoratus Thunb. was a native of Mauritius, and Vitis trifoliata Thunb. of Surinam, whilst others hailed from Ceylon. One additional species earlier described by Thunberg is included in our report, viz. Bignonia javanica Thunb., nomen.

One plant-geographical remark may precede the alphabetically arranged list of the identification: though the bulk of Thunberg's plants were collected in the lowland of Java, apparently in the environs of Batavia, two plants of his Javan collection have undoubtedly been collected at at least 800 m altitude, viz. Anotis hirsuta and Pratia nummularia. These have been collected either S. of Batavia or S. of Semarang.

The species alphabetically listed below are preceded by the number they bear in the Florula Javanica. At the end of the reference the locality where they were collected is cited in accordance with Bergius's notes on the sheets.

43. Acrostichum lineare Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 23. — Java.

This is reduced to **Stenochlaena palustris** (Burm. f.) Bedd. Cf.
Backer & Posthumus, Varenflora v. Java (1939) 150.

25. Arum purpureum Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 20. — Java.

According to Engl. Pfl. R. IV, 23, F (1920) 97 dubious, but as Schott noted rightly on the type specimen, identical with *Homalomena rubescens* (Roxb.) Kunth. As Roxburgh's basinym dates from 1832, this species, which is not rare near Batavia must be called **Homalomena purpurea** (Thunb.) B. B. S., comb. nov. It is not, as is asserted in Ind. Kew. a species from Japan.

34. Clerodendron spicatum Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 22. - Ceylon.

According to Lam & Bakhuizen van den Brink, Bull. J. B. B. III, 3 (1921) 78 possibly synonymous, with Clerodendron serratum. The specimen undoubtedly represents a well-known Javan drug of the genus Orthosiphon, commonly known as Orthosiphon stamineus Bth. in Wall. (1831). This is antedated by the name O. aristatus (Bl. 1826) Miq. [O. grandiflorus (Bl.) Bold.]. A still older epithet is used in Orthosiphon spiralis (Lour.) Merr., Lingnan Agr. Rev. 2 (1925) 137, but it seems that the type specimen of Loureiro's is missing (as was affirmed by Dr G. Taylor, May 1949) or has, at any rate, not been properly identified, and that, therefore, its interpretation is liable to doubt. Thus, the correct name for this plant seems to be Orthosiphon spicatus (Thunb.) B. B. S., comb. nov. Why this very common drug was not botanically described earlier than 1825 is not quite understandable.

Bignonia javanica Thunb. Mus. Ups. xvii (1794) 150; Fl. Ceyl.

1825, 7, nomen; Juel, p. 321. — Java.

This plant of which the vernacular name was given as "kudo" is present in 3 sheets with an immature pod and 3 leaves. It represents **Dolichandrone spathacea** (L. f.) K. Sch. Why this species, which was collected in Java, was mentioned in the Florula Ceylanica and not in the Florula Javanica is not clear.

39. Croton spiciflorum Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 23.

Apparently, based on Caturus spiciflorus Burm. According to Mueller Arg. there were 2 specimens representing Claoxylon indicum (Reinw. ex Bl.) Endl. ex Hassk. According to Corner this species should not be called Cl. polot (Burm. f.) Merr. (cf. Gard. Bull. S. S. 10, p. 292).

37. Croton brbiculare Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 23. — Java.

This is clearly identical with the species currently known as *Mallotus moluccanus* M. A.. Merrill has shown (Enum. Philip. Fl. Pl. 2, 1923, 432) that the basinym derived from *Croton moluccanus* L. cannot be used, as Linné's type specimens represent two other *Euphorbiaceae*.

This plant should be called Melanolepis multiglandulosa (Bl. 1825) Rchb. f. & Zoll. As neither the exact month of publication of Thunberg's Florula nor the exact month of publication of Blume's 12th "Bijdragen" is known we have to provisionally accept them to be simultaneously published in the year 1825. As Blume's epithet, derived from a nomen nudum of Reinwardt (ex Blume Cat. Hort. 1823, p. 105), is better known than that of Thunberg we have chosen it as the correct one.

40. Croton peltatum Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 23. — Java.

Based on Ricinus tomentosus Thunb. Diss. Ric. (1815) 6 = Mallotus ricinoides (Pers.) M. A. 38. Croton reticulatum Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 23. — Ceylon.

This name is pre-empted by C. reticulatum Willd. (1805). According to Muell. Arg. it is Coelodiscus thunbergianus M. A. in DC. (1866). However, its identity is uncertain. Trimen (Handb. Fl. Ceyl. 3. p. 68) says it is doubtful and probably belongs to Mallotus rhamnifolius M. A. but Pax & Hoffmann distinguish it as a separate species allied to M. eriocarpus M. A. and gave it a new name M. thunbergianus (M. A.) P. & H. (Pfl. R. IV, 147, VII, 1914, 162). This, however, belongs in a section different from that of M. rhamnifolius.

33. Justicia spathulata Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 22. — Java.

There are two specimens in Thunberg's Herbarium, both representing Peristrophe bivalvis (L.) Merr. The vernacular "boa cletong" cited by Thunberg as a Malay name is unknown to us. It is the common, cultivated form described under the name Peristrophe tinctoria (Roxb.) Nees which was formerly distinguished as a distinct species. The other specimen is also a Peristrophe which, however, in the absence of developed flowers, we cannot identify with any Malaysian species. It is not conspecific. The Ind. Kew. cited the species wrongly to be described in Thunb. Fl. Jap.

3. Kaempferia speciosa Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 8.

This was identified by Wahlenberg as representing Hedychium coronarium Koen, in Retz. (1783).

26. Lagerstroemia javanica Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 21. — Java. Incolis Pulaja.

The specimen represented is clearly identical with Lagerstroemia speciosa (L.) Pers.

11. Lobelia javanica Thunb. Mem. Ups. Append. V (1797) 105, nomen; Fl. Jav. (1825) 9. — e Java et Ceylona.

The specimen clearly represents Pratia nummularia (Lamk.) Kurz, as F. E. Wimmer already indicated on the sheet.

6. Oldenlandia hirsuta L. f. Suppl. (1781) 127; Thunberg, Fl. Jav. (1825) 8. — Java.

Thunberg's specimen undoubtedly represents the species described by the younger Linné and which is now called Anotis hirsuta (L. f.) Mig. ex Backer & Van Slooten, Geillustr. Handb. Theeonkr. (1924) 203, not Hochr. (1925) as in Ind. Kew.

7. Oldenlandia linearifolia Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 9. — e Java et Ceylona. This is the common weed Hedyotis corymbosa (L.) Lamk.

9. Oldenlandia longiflora Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 9. — Java.

This is a homonym of O. longiflora Lamk. which is now reduced to Rondeletia pilosa. Thunberg's specimen represents apparently a small-flowered Ophiorrhiza with awned stipules. Failing a revision of this difficult genus, we feel not justified to name it; nomenclaturally it has no value.

8. Oldenlandia nudiflora Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 9. — Java.

The sheet represents a specimen of Hedvotis ovatifolia Cav

10. Oldenlandia triflora Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 9. — e Ceylona, incolis galapala.

There are 3 sheets, all marked Ceylon. All belong to the very common **Hedyotis biflora** (L.) Lamk.

4. Ophrys lancea Thunb. ex Sw. in Vet. Acad. Handl. Stockh. xxi (1800) 223, descr.!; Fl. Jav. (1825) 8. — Java.

This clearly represents Spiranthes australis Lindl. (1824). Apparently the oldest name is Aristotelea spiralis Lour. The epithet spiralis, however, can not be used in Spiranthes because of Spiranthes spiralis Koch (1849). The next two specific epithets are those of Epidendrum aristotelia Raeusch. 1797 and Neottia sinensis Pers. (1807). Both these names are typified by Loureiro's description. According to F. T. Hubbard (Bot. Mus. Leafl. Harv. Univ. 4, 1937, 85—89) Raeuschel's epithet is illegitimate, but Persoon was fully justified in proposing a new epithet because of the combination Neottia spiralis Willdenow (1805), or rather (L.) Sw. ex Willd. — Willdenow had, apparently, accession to Swartz's text of the Fl. Ind. Occ. before it was published, since Willdenow in 1805 even cites the pages in Swartz, though Swartz's 3rd volume is dated, acc. to Pritzel. 1806.

The correct name seems therefore to be Spiranthes lancea (Thunb.)

B. B. S., comb. nov.

24. Pandanus odoratus Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 19.

This specific name is questioned by Martelli, Webbia 4 (1913) 26, who doubted it to represent a Pandanus. To Pandanus odoratissimus L. f. Suppl. (1781) 26 was added "Thunb." In the same year Thunberg described Keura odora Thunb. Nov. Gen. Pl. 1 (1781) 26. Whether these names are all based on the same material of Thunberg is uncertain. This uncertainty is increased by the notes on the herbarium sheets marked fol., Q and O, which run: fol.: "e Java, Ceylona. C. P. Thunberg ex insula Mauritiana, malay pudak."; Q: "e Ceylona Thunberg"; and O: "e Java, Ceylona. C. P. Thunberg. ex insula Mauritiana". The O specimen has certainly inflorescences of 2 different species. The upper left partial inflor. of O may belong to fol.

The description also presents some peculiar features, e.g. the "flowers" are stated to be "monoecious", which in Malaysian *Pandanus* is never the case.

It seems that the description is based on two different species. Moreover, we do not believe that the specimens have been collected in Java. They cannot be identified with the aid of Backer's key (Handbook Flora Java part 1, 1925, 36).

Ruellia serrata Thunb. in Nov. Act. Soc. Sc. Upsal. vii (1815) 143;
 Fl. Jav. (1825) 21. — Java.

According to the Ind. Kew. the original description of Thunberg referred to a Japanese species and was reduced by Nees in DC. Prod. 11: 161, to Bonnaya penicillata Nees. As Juel (l. c. p. 313) rightly remarked, the only specimen in Thunberg's herbarium, which we have examined is doubtless different from the plant of his original description, and, therefore, not its type specimen. It typifies his description of Ruellia serrata sensu Florula Javanica, and represents a specimen of Ilysanthes ruelloides (Colsm. 1793) O. K. (= I. reptans [Roxb.] Urban); the identity of the Japanese species needs clarification. A new synonym of this species is Ilysanthes aristo-serrata Hayata from Formosa.

32. Ruellia tetragona Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 22. — e Java et Ceylona.

The specimen represents Artanema longifolia (L.) Wettst. ex
Bold. (1916).

22. Triumfetta urticaefolia Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 19. — Ceylon.

This represents T. suffruticosa Bl. As both names date from 1825 it seems preferable to adopt Blume's name.

23. Uvaria javanica Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 19. — Java.

This was reduced to *Unona tripetaloidea* Dun. by Ind. Kew. However, there are two specimens, marked 1 and 2. No. 1 = Canangium odoratum (Lamk.) Baill. ex King, the other represents Desmos chinensis Lour. The description only refers to *Canangium*.

16. Vitis trifoliata Thunb. Fl. Jav. (1825) 11. — Surinam.

On the back of the sheet it is noted that the specimen came from Surinam where it was collected by Dahlberg. It is clearly identical with Vitis erosa (L. C. Rich.) Baker (Cissus erosa L. C. Rich.).