

**VIII. VAN BREDA'S GENERA ET SPECIES ORCHIDEARUM FASC. III  
EFFECTIVELY PUBLISHED**

M. J. VAN STEENIS-KRUSEMAN &amp; J. F. VELDKAMP

Rijksherbarium / Hortus Botanicus, Leiden, The Netherlands

The thin formidable-sized folio book by J.G.S. van Breda 'Genera et species Orchidearum, etc.' is a little-known publication even to orchidologists, as most of the new names proposed in it have disappeared into synonymy long ago. It was never finished, only three fascicles of the eighteen promised are generally supposed to have been published. For their publication dates see De Wit (1950) and Stafleu & Cowan (1976).

In the library of the former 'Koloniaal Museum', Haarlem, the Netherlands, now the 'Koninklijk Instituut voor de Tropen' (KIT), Amsterdam, the former draughtsman of the Flora Malesiana Foundation and amateur orchidologist J. Vuijk found a copy which contained not three, but four fascicles. At that time this was merely briefly noted (Van Steenis-Kruseman, 1965).

Last year my (vS-K) interest was renewed when manuscript papers of Kuhl & Van Hasselt surfaced at Leiden and I decided to visit the KIT library to examine this copy myself. It indeed consisted of 4 fascicles: 20 plates with 40 pages of text. Three labels with the printed contents of fascicles I, II and III, and a handwritten one of the certainly validly published fascicle III apparently cut from the original covers of the fascicles, have been pasted inside the old slightly worn binding. The 4th fascicle ('III'), as to its way of printing, coloured plates, etc., exactly matches the three earlier ones, and in the sequence of taxa shows a seamless fit: *Pomatocalpa spicatum* of fasc. III followed by *Pomatocalpa diffusum* of fasc. III.

Ms. A. van Opzeeland-Winkel, Librarian of the KIT, kindly permitted the copy to be sent out on loan to L, where photographs were made of text and plates. This cooperation is here gratefully acknowledged.

The crux for nomenclature is the existence of this 4th fascicle in which three new genera and six new species were named and depicted. Stafleu & Cowan (1976) stated that 'the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature requires the distribution of at least two copies'. Article 29 (1) (ICBN, 1972, and later editions) does state 'distribution ... to ... institutions', by the use of the plural implying more than one copy, but no actual minimal amount is specified.

If we accept their dictum this fourth fascicle would be of no consequence for nomenclature and could be regarded as a mere curiosity, ineffectively published, even when it was a 'distribution of printed matter (through sale, exchange, or gift)' to an institute with a library accessible to botanists.

Some nagging thoughts remained: was there only a single copy? Where did it come from?

We first played with the idea that the copy of the Koloniaal Museum might have been a proof in Van Breda's possession. In 1839 he was appointed Secretary of the Hollandsche Maatschappij der Wetenschappen at Haarlem, the town where manuscript papers turned up towards the end of the 19th century (Greshoff, 1903). This proved improbable, in the first place from Breda's correspondence with the Minister of the Interior (cf. De Wit, 1950), and

secondly from the fact that Van Breda's library was auctioned at Leiden (June 10, 1868, by Van der Hoek Frères) and only included an incomplete copy of the book (3 fascicles, and even then 1 plate and 3 pages of text lacking).

From Breda's letters it is known that uncoloured plates were present with the printers at Gent [Vandeker(c)khove] at the time of the Belgian uprising against the Dutch, 25 August 1830. The firm soon afterwards fell into disgrace because its too Dutch-friendly attitude and was liquidated. Under contract the printer was required to hand over the unpublished and as yet uncoloured plates at first notice to the Dutch government. Blume certainly had a different plan of dealing with new Javanese species, and as far as known to us the plates have never been claimed and must have been lost. At Gent no archive documents are present (letter Dr. F. van der Veken, GENT, 10 December 1990).

From the fact that the plates in fascicle IIII are coloured it may be surmised that at least one of the draughtsmen, or the lithographer, or the printer, if not all, must have been involved after 25 August 1830. It may be assumed that the copies were sold rather soon after that date.

It is not known at present how the copy came to the Museum, because in these early years the archives of the institute were not accessible, not being arranged. The archivist in charge, Mr. J. Kubajewycz, tried but could not find any documents.

Anyway, it was mentioned in the acquisition list for 1905 (Anon., 1906). Possibly there is a connection with Dr. M. Greshoff, the Director of the Museum at that time. In 1895 he had been presented with manuscript papers (or copies) of Kuhl & Van Hasselt by Mr. A.H. van Tubergen who died in 1901), a dispenser in Haarlem. The latter had acquired them into the bargain at an auction (see Greshoff, 1903) and regarded them merely as curiosities. Did he perhaps there and then also buy the Breda copy now in the KIT?

Convinced that the KIT copy was not unique we initiated a search through the various libraries of the Netherlands and abroad. Dr. D.K. Ferguson, Antwerp, circulated a request through Belgium, which turned up the presence of a copy of Breda's work in the Bibliothèque Universitaire Moretus Plantin of Namur. Ms. A.M. Bogaert-Damin, the conservator there, kindly checked the work and discovered the predicted second copy of the fourth fascicle! We are very grateful to them for their assistance.

The Namur copy contains 38 pages and 19 plates, so one species is missing from it. It was received from the legacy of the Belgian Count Alfred de Limminghe (1834–1861), who was an avid mycologist, horticulturist, and collector of rare prints (Bogaert-Damin & Piron, 1984).

The discovery of this second copy establishes its irrefutably effective publication. This has the following consequences:

*Conchoglossum*, *Orthoglottis*, and *Macrotis* are new genera. These names and the combinations made under them could not be found in any reference book, which suggests that no copy of fascicle IIII came to the attention of the various compilers and revisors. Older generic names are fortunately present for them.

*Macrotis* Raf. (1834) becomes a later homonym. This name is mentioned in Willis' Dictionary (Airy Shaw, 1973), but it was not taken up by the Index Kewensis. According to Merrill (1949) it is an alternative name for *Macrotrys* Raf., a synonym of *Cimicifuga* Wernischek (Ranunculaceae).

As far as the specific combinations are concerned, all but one are antedated by older ones. *Pomatocalpa diffusum* Breda must replace *Pomatocalpa latifolium* (Lindley) J.J. Smith,

based on *Cleisostoma latifolia* Lindley (1840). The apparently very rarely mentioned *Dendrobium barbatum* Cogn. (1897) from Northern Burma if a 'good' species needs a new combination.

Librarians who want to check their copy for the presence of the fourth fascicle will have to look for the names listed below as neither page nor plate numbers are present. The sequence is not necessarily that as given here, the Namur copy for instance has *Armadorum distichum* as the last page. Some catalogues list this work under 'Kuhl (or K uhl) & Van Hasselt', who were the collectors of the material, but not co-authors, having died in 1821 and 1823 respectively.

Copies (probably) known to contain all four fascicles or part of them are in the KIT and Namur. Copies certain to have the first three fascicles are in L and the University Library of Nijmegen (courtesy of its librarian). The microfiche edition (IDC 5026) was made of the L copy. Other copies with unknown contents have been reported for BO, G, and K (Greshoff, 1903) and the University Library of Utrecht. According to the National Union Catalog there is no copy in the U.S.A. (Dr. D.H. Nicolson, in litt.), nor in AWH or BRUX (Dr. D.K. Ferguson, in litt.). In Belgium JFV visited the Town Libraries of Brugge and Gent, to no avail.

#### FASCICLE I (18 November 1828)

<i>Polychilos cornu-cervi</i>	<i>Phalaenopsis cornu-cervi</i> (Breda) Blume & Rchb. f.
<i>Macrostylis disticha</i> *	<i>Corymborchis veratrifolia</i> (Reinw.) Blume
<i>Sestochilos uniflorum</i>	<i>Bulbophyllum lobii</i> Lindley
<i>Odontostylis triflora</i>	<i>Bulbophyllum triflorum</i> (Breda) Blume (see note)
<i>Odontostylis multiflora</i>	<i>Bulbophyllum multiflorum</i> (Breda) Kr�nzlin
<i>Octomeria vaginata</i> *	<i>Eria javanica</i> (Sw.) Blume

#### FASCICLE II (January–June 1829)

<i>Armadorum distichum</i> *	<i>Arachnis sulingii</i> (Blume) Rchb. f.
<i>Styloglossum nervosum</i> *	<i>Calanthe pulchra</i> (Blume) Lindley
<i>Cionisaccus lanceolatus</i>	<i>Goodyera procera</i> (Ker-Gawl) Hook.
<i>Psychechilos gracile</i>	<i>Zeuxine gracilis</i> (Breda) Blume
<i>Orchipedum plantaginifolium</i>	<i>Orchipedum plantaginifolium</i> Breda

#### FASCICLE III (15 August 1829)

<i>Octomeria paucifolia</i>	<i>Tainia paucifolia</i> (Blume) J.J. Smith
<i>Octomeria racemosa</i> *	<i>Eria multiflora</i> (Blume) Lindley
<i>Vanda pauciflora</i> *	<i>Thrixspermum arachnites</i> (Blume) Rchb. f.
<i>Hippoglossum umbellatum</i> *	<i>Bulbophyllum lepidum</i> (Blume) J.J. Smith
<i>Pomatocalpa spicatum</i>	<i>Pomatocalpa spicatum</i> Breda

#### FASCICLE IIII (after 25 August 1830)

<i>Pomatocalpa diffusum</i> *	<i>Pomatocalpa latifolium</i> (Lindley, 1840!) J.J. Smith
<i>Conchoglossum montanum</i> *	<i>Cyrtosia javanica</i> Blume (1825)
<i>Conchoglossum silvestre</i> *	<i>Galeola nudiflora</i> Lour. (1790)
<i>Dendrobium barbatum</i> *	<i>Flickingeria angulata</i> (Blume, 1825) A.D. Hawkes
<i>Orthoglottis imbricata</i> *	<i>Dendrobium aloifolium</i> (Blume, 1825) Rchb. f.
<i>Macrotis anceps</i> *	<i>Ceratostylis anceps</i> Blume (1825)

The species described by Van Breda were identified by J.J. Vermeulen and E.F. de Vogel [\* names not mentioned by Comber (1990)].

Note — The combination *Bulbophyllum triflorum* (Breda) Blume is not present in the Index Kewensis and the page on which J.J. Smith (1905) said it was published ['Fl. Jav. n. s. (1858) vii'] does not exist. In fact there are no new combinations in this Praefatio (introduction) and no species of *Bulbophyllum* in the whole book! The reference probably is to the introduction of Blume (1828), where many generic reductions are made, but not of *Odontostylis*, and no specific (re)combinations at all. The earliest reference to *B. triflorum* which I can find is in Miquel (1859). He also gives the curious reference to 'Praef. p. VII'. If I understand the situation well the correct citation would be *B. triflorum* (Breda) Blume ex Miq. — JFV.

#### LITERATURE

- Airy Shaw, H.K. (Ed.). 1973. A dictionary of the flowering plants and ferns, ed. 8: 702. Cambridge.
- Anon. (J.C. van Galen?). 1906. Aanwinsten der boekerij in 1905. Bull. Kolon. Mus. Haarlem 34: 204–205.
- Blume, C.L. 1828. *Florae Javae*: vii ('Praef.' = 'introd.'). Brussels.
- Blume, C.L. 1858. *Florae Java*, n. s. 1: i–vi ('Praef.' = 'introd.'). Leiden, Amsterdam.
- Bogaert-Damin, A.-M. & J. Piron. 1984. *Livres de fleurs du XVIe au XXe siècle*: 4–5, 122. Namur.
- Breda, J.G.S. van. 1827–1830. *Genera et species Orchidearum et Asclepiadearum quas in itinere per insulam Java etc.* 4 fasc., 20 tab. col., 40 pp, letterpress without any numbering. Gandavi (Gent).
- Comber, J.B. 1990. *Orchids of Java*: 1–407. Kew.
- Greshoff, M. 1903. Kuhl & Van Hasselt, eene episode in het Nederlandsch-Indisch natuuronderzoek. *Album der Natuur* 1903: 60–88 (87!).
- Merrill, E.D. 1949. *Index rafinesquianus*. Jamaica Plain.
- Miquel, F.A.W. 1859. *Flora Indiae batavae* 3: 646. Amsterdam, etc.
- Smith, J.J. 1905. *Die Orchideen von Java*. *Flora von Buitenzorg* 6: 436. Leiden.
- Stafleu, F.A. & R.S. Cowan. 1976. *Taxonomic literature*, ed. 2, 1: 313. Utrecht.
- Steenis-Kruseman, M.J. van. 1965. Dates of publication and bibliographic notes. *Fl. Males. Bull.* no. 20: 1274.
- Wit, H.C.D. de. 1950. Dates of publication of Malaysian phytotaxonomical literature. V. *Fl. Males. Bull.* no. 6: 165–167.