

NOTES ON MALAY COMPOSITAE II

by

J O S É P H I N E T H. K O S T E R

(Rijksherbarium, Leiden)

(Issued 1. VI. 1948).

After the possibility of studying type material from abroad had returned, a specimen of *Blumea acutata* DC. var. β from Timor, to which was added a label with the handwriting of Decaisne, was seen by me, thanks to the kindness of the Director of the "Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle", Paris. *Blumea acutata* DC. var. β (Prodr. V, 1836, 438) differs from the species, according to the description principally in the shape of the lower leaves, which, however, are lacking in the specimen seen by me. After examining the receptacle, it appeared, that it was hairy like that of *Blumea intermedia* Koster (in Blumea IV, 1941, 486), whereas no other reason was found to separate this species from *Blumea acutata* DC. var. β . However, during a visit to the "Conservatoire et Jardin Botaniques", Geneva, the Director kindly allowed me to inspect the species of *Blumea* in the herbarium De Candolle, which is like a natural illustration to the Prodr. As under the name *Blumea acutata* DC. (in Decaisne in Nouv. Ann. Mus. d'Hist. nat. T. 3, 1834, 409) three different forms allied to *Blumea lacera* (Burm.) DC. were found, it seems reasonable to keep the name *Blumea intermedia* upright.

On the other hand it is no longer justified to consider *Blumea floresiana* (Schultz-Bip.) Boerl. (Fl. Ned. Ind. II, 1899, 239) a variety of *Blumea acutata* DC. as was done by the present author in Blumea IV, 1941, 488. So the species *Blumea floresiana* (Schultz-Bip.) Boerl. must be kept upright.

Still other interesting facts came to light during the inspection of the herbarium De Candolle.

Blumea humifusa (Miq.) Clarke (Comp. ind., 1876, 72) appeared to be a synonym of *Blumea tenella* DC. (Prodr. V, 1836, 433), of which fact Backer (Handb. Suikerr. Java VII, 1934, 766) had noticed the probability already. *Blumea amplexans* DC. is allied to this species, but is has a different general appearance. After the statement, made above, *Blumea humifusa* (Miq.) Clarke var. *monochasialis* Koster (l. c. 489) must be named *Blumea tenella* DC. var. *monochasialis* (Koster) Koster.

Blumea lacera (Burm.) DC. var. *burmanni* DC. (Prodr. V, 1836, 436) had perhaps better not be considered a variety, though its leaves are fairly profoundly incised.

Blumea runcinata DC. (l. c. 438) is a synonym of *Blumea lacera* (Burm.) DC.; it was considered a separate species by Miquel (Fl. ind. bat. II, 1856, 46) and Clarke (l. c. 78).

Blumea fasciculata DC. (l. c. 442) is a synonym of *Blumea sessiliflora* Decaisne (l. c. 410), a variable species described from Timor and also found on Java. In the herbarium De Candolle a specimen on which Decaisne himself has written "*Pluchea sessiliflora* nob." is to be found under the name *Blumea fasciculata*. Clarke (l. c. 81) unites a number of species of De Candolle, *Bl. fasciculata*, *racemosa*, *glomerata*, *gracilis*, *purpurea*, *leptoclada* and *holosericea*, under the first name, which was changed by Kurz (in Journ. As. Soc. Bengal 46, 2, 1877, 187) into *Blumea fistulosa* (Roxb.) Kurz. Hooker (Fl. Br. Ind. III, 1882, 262) used the name *Blumea glomerata* DC. for the species. All three authors, however, described the receptacle of this species to be velvety or pubescent, sometimes, moreover, having long white hairs. The Javanese specimens, like the type specimen, as to Decaisne's description, have a glabrous receptacle, now and then with very few short central hairs, or the receptacle is minutely fringed around the central alveoles. The specimen of *Blumea glomerata* in the herbarium De Candolle has smaller heads than *Blumea sessiliflora*. *Blumea leptoclada* DC. is a synonym of *Blumea glomerata*. It seems to be advisable to keep the two species, *Bl. sessiliflora* Decaisne and *Blumea fistulosa* (Roxb.) Kurz. separate, though they are closely related.

Under the name *Blumea chinensis* (L.) DC. we find in the herbarium De Candolle three specimens of *Blumea riparia* (Bl.) DC. and one of *Blumea bullata* Koster (l. c. 489) and also the species *Blumea semivestita* DC. (l. c. 445) in the herbarium De Candolle is a mixture of these two species. *Blumea semivestita* DC. is mostly treated as a synonym of *Blumea procera* DC. (Clarke l. c. 86, Hooker l. c. 268, Gagnepain in Lec. Fl. Indo-Chine III, 1924, 528). Unfortunately the heads of *Blumea procera* DC. are very young in the specimen in the herbarium De Candolle; this species is related to *Blumea bullata* Koster.

Summary:

The names *Blumea intermedia* Koster (syn. *Bl. acutata* DC. var. β) and *Blumea floresiana* (Schultz-Bip.) Boerl. must be kept upright.

Blumea humifusa (Miq.) Clarke var. *monochasialis* Koster has to be changed into *Blumea tenella* DC. var. *monochasialis* (Koster) Koster, for *Blumea humifusa* (Miq.) Clarke is a synonym of *Blumea tenella* DC.

Blumea lacera (Burm.) DC. var. *burmanni* DC. is not a clearly distinguishable variety.

Blumea runcinata DC. is a synonym of *Blumea lacera* (Burm.) DC.

Blumea fasciculata DC. is a synonym of *Blumea sessiliflora* Decaisne, which is not a synonym of the closely related *Blumea fistulosa* (Roxb.) Kurz (syn. *Bl. glomerata* DC. and *Bl. leptoclada* DC.).

Blumea chinensis (L.) DC. as well as *Blumea semivestita* DC. are a mixture of *Blumea riparia* (Bl.) DC. and *Blumea bullata* Koster.