IX. PROPOSALS FOR CONSERVATION OF SOME GENERIC NAMES OF MALAYSIAN PLANTS.

Though the list of nomina generica conservanda must be kept as small as possible, both the spirit of the rules and wish of all taxonomists is to aim at stabilizing nomenclature. In general the number of new combinations necessary through the digging up of an old name or the discovery of the identity of a mis-identified plant will be decisive.

If the number of new combinations towards the one or the other side are nearly equal, the generic name which has been in current use will generally be favoured. If no new combinations are necessary, the current use only will be regarded as the reasonable decision.

Proposal I. Conservation of the generic name Didissandra CLARKE against Ellobum BLUME.

In 1826 C.L.BLUME described a new monospecific genus Ellobum BL. Bijdr.Fl.Ned.Ind.part 14 (1826) 746 with one species Ellobum montanum Bl. (l.c.p.747) which is given without specific description. He assumed it to represent a member of the Scrophulariaceae. On the strength of the very brief description BENTHAM reduced it to Vandellia as V.ellobum BTH. (in DC.Prodr.10 (1846) 417). In 1947 Dr R.C. BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK Jr located the type-material of Ellobum montanum BL. in the Leyden Herbarium. Drs BAKHUIZEN V.D.BRINK, BACKER & V.STEENIS have examined the sheets and confirm that the species belongs to a genus of the Gesneraceae now generally recognized as Didissandra CLARKE (in DC.Monogr.Phan. 5 (1883) 65). The type specimens were collected in West Java, Bantam Res. by KUHL & VAN HASSELT; a good diagnosis in their handwriting is present with the herbarium. The same species has later been found several times in the same part of West Java, and has been hitherto wrongly identified as Didymocarpus reptans JACK. Under that name a figure was published by BEUMEE (De Tropische Natuur 8 (1919) 62, fig.9).

In view of the fact that the real identity of Ellobum has remained hitherto entirely obscure and that it comprises only one species, whereas of Didissandra over 80 species have been recorded according to Index Kewensis, it appears reasonable to stabilize nomenclature by proposing to add Ellobum B. to the nomina generica rejicienda and to conserve Didissandra CLARKE so to avoid the entrance of 80 new combinations in Didissandra. The status runs then as follows:

Didissandra CLARKE in DC.Monogr.Phan.5 (1883) 65, nom.cons.-- Ellobum Bl. Bijdr.part 14 (1826) 746, nom.rej.
Type-species: D.elongata CLARKE, l.c.67.

Didissandra montanum (Bl.) BAKH.f.comb.nov. -- Ellobum montanum Bl. Bijdr.part 14 (1826) 747. -- Vandellia ellobum BTH. in DC.Prod.10 (1846) 417. -- Didymocarpus reptans (non JACK) BEUMÉE, De Trop.Natuur 8 (1919) 62, fig.9.

Proposal II. Conservation of the generic name Houttuynia THUNB. against Houttuynia HOUTT.

In 1780 HOUTTUYN described a genus Houttuynia represented by one species viz H.capensis HOUTT. (Nat.Hist.II, 12, p.448, t.85,f.3) the exact identification of which has remained obscure for a long time. This is now placed in Iridaceae and reduced to Ixia paniculata DE LA ROCHE (Descr.Pl.Nov.25 (1776)t.1, see also BAKER in THIS-DYER,Fl.Cap.6 (1896) 85 and MERRILL in Journ.Arn.Arbor.19 (1939) 328).

In 1784 THUNBERG described a genus Houttuynia THUNB. (Fl. Jap. (1784) 234, t.26) in Saururaceae. Since more than a century this has been recognized and recorded in SE and E Asiatic floras,in textbooks, in botanical gardens and in catalogues. Though THUNBERG originally spelled the name Houtuynia the correct spelling is Houttuynia. THUNBERG's genus clearly is homonymous with Houttuynia HOUTT.

Strictly according to the Rules Houttuynia THUNB. is an illegitimate name. Polypara LOUR. (Fl.Coch.(1790) 61, ed. WILLD. (1793) 78) is a later synonym; it has only been adopted by O.KUNTZE (Rev.Gen.Pl. (1891) 565).

Since, however, Houttuynia THUNB. has been in current use for a very long period and is mentioned under this name in numerous floras, garden catalogues, medical, horticultural and textbooks all over the world, there is good reason to stabilize nomenclature in this case by adopting Houttuynia THUNB. as a conserved name, while adding Houttuynia HOUTT. to the nomina rejicienda, as seems also Dr MERRILL's intention (cf.Trans.Amer.Phil.Soc.Philad.N.S., XXIV (1935) pt II,126). No new combinations are needed in any case.

Proposal III. Conservation of Endospermum BTH. against Endespermum BL. = Endospermum ENDL.

In 1823 C.L.BLUME briefly described a leguminous genus Endespermum which was later reduced to Dalbergia. ENDLICHER (Gen.1841, 1304) accepted this name under the typographic variant Endospermum, thus pre-emptying the generic name which was later given by BENTHAM to a well-known genus of Euphorbiaceae: Endospermum BTH. Fl.Hongk. (1861) 304. It seems hence necessary to preserve Endospermum BTH. of which over a dozen species are described against Endespermum BL. and Endospermum ENDL.

Proposal IV. Conservation of Campnosperma THW. against Coelopyrum JACK.

In 1822 WILLIAM JACK described a new genus Coelopyrum which has - as far as I know - remained obscure. It was generally considered a genus incert.sed. until HALLIER f., in 1921, found that it was identical with Campnosperma THW. This was later corroborated at Buitenzorg by Dr Beumée, and presently also by Dr Kostermans. Jack's description leaves no doubt about its identity. In the meantime about 20 species have been described in the widely distributed genus under Campnosperma. A reinstatement of Jack's generic name would involve therefore 20 new combinations for a genus which is wellknown in papers on forestry, taxonomy and plant geography from the Mascarenes to the Solomons. Therefore, it is desirable to conserve Campnosperma against Coelopyrum, published in the very rare journal Malayan Miscellanies. Campnosperma THWAITES in HOOK. Kew Journ.VI (1854) 65, t.1, nom. cons. -- Coelopyrum JACK, in Mal.Misc.II (1822) part VII, 65; reimpr. in HOOK.Comp.Bot.Mag.1 (1835) 220,nom rejic.- Cf.HALLIER f. Beih.Bot.Centr.Bl.39,II (1921) 161/2. Campnosperma coriacea (JACK) HALL. f.comb.nov. (syn. Coelopyrum coriaceum Jack, l.c.).

Proposal V. Conservation of Trigonostemon BLUME against Enchidium JACK.

Enchidium Jack was described in 1822 after a Sumatran plant three years before BLUME created the genus Trigonostemon (Trigostemon) in 1825. Jack's name was, however, never taken up and in Ind.Kew. intentionally inserted in the synonymy of Blume's genus though its priority was recognized. Its only species was reduced to Tr.indicus M.A. Therefore Enchidium has remained monospecific as Jack made it.In Trigonostemon however, over 80 species have been recognised.

In view of the enormous number of new combinations necessary for reinstating JACK's generic name it seems reasonable to suppress it and propose it for the list of nomina generica conservanda.

Trigonostemon BLUME, Bijdragen Fl.Ned.Ind. pt 12 (1825) 600 (Trigostemon) nom.cons. -- Enchidium JACK, in Mal.Misc. II (1822) number VII., 89, reimpr. in HOOK. Comp.Bot.Mag. 1 (1836) 257; Letters p.230, nom.rej.

Trigonostemon verticillatus (JACK) PAX, in Pfl.Reich 88 (1911) 87. -- Enchidium verticillatum Jack, l.c. -- Trigonostemon indicum M.A. Linnaea 34 (1865/6) 214.