

3.1–3.8mm) distinguenda. A *S. glabrata* Choisy pilis caulinis saepissime dendroideis (nec simplicibus), foliis primariis maximis 0.8–1.8mm latis (nec 0.25–0.8mm) velutinis (nec pilis sparsis minutis indutis), bracteis calycibusque velutinis (nec pilis paucis praecipue in marginibus) differt.

Type: South Africa, Cape, c.3219 DC, Zwart Ruggens, 'Groenfontein', 3500ft, 28 ix 1926, *Levy*s 1923 (holo. BOL).

Selago spectabilis Hilliard, sp. nov. a *S. pinguicula* E. Mey. bracteis minoribus, c.2.3–3 × 1.1–1.8mm (nec c.4–7 × 2–3.8mm) nec basi valde sacculatis nec transverse rugosis, calyce 1.7–2mm longo (nec 3–5.4mm), corollae tubo 2.8–3.8mm longo (nec 4–5.5mm), limbo varie violaceo (nec albo) distinguenda.

Type: South Africa, Cape, 3119 BD, Akkerendam Reserve, 24 viii 1988, *Batten* 881 (holo. E).

Selago subspinosa Hilliard, sp. nov. a *S. namaquensis* Schltr. foliis plerumque minoribus (4–11 × 0.5–1.5mm, nec 7–20 × 1.3–3.8mm), marginibus valde (nec leviter) revolutis, racemis plerumque solitariis (nec paniculam pyramidalem formantibus), calyce 2.8–3.2mm longo (nec 1.5–2mm), corolla varie violaceo (nec albo) differt.

Type: South Africa, Cape, 3320 AD, farm Kruis Rivier 109, 28 viii 1986, *Cloete & Haselau* 76 (holo. NBG).

Selago welwitschii Rolfe var. *australis* Hilliard, var. nov. a planta typica habitu (caulibus erectis vel suberectis, nec prostratis), foliis crassis costa invisibili (nec foliis tenuibus costa praecipue in pagina inferiore visibili), marginibus valde (nec leviter) revolutis, paniculis c.100–155mm longis (nec 100–350mm), pedunculis 2–12mm (nec 8–26mm), planta exsiccata viridi-grisea (nec fusca) distinguenda.

Type: South Africa, Cape, Hay div., 2822 DA, Witsand, iv 1940, *Esterhuysen* 2268 (holo. BOL).

O. M. HILLIARD, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, UK

Lectotypification of *Tetraedrocarpus arabicus* O. Schwartz (Boraginaceae)

Tetraedrocarpus arabicus O. Schwartz is the type of the genus *Tetraedrocarpus* O. Schwartz (Boraginaceae), which is now considered a synonym of *Echiochilon* Desf. Within the latter, the correct name for the species is *E. arabicum* (O. Schwartz) I.M. Johnst. *E. arabicum* is restricted to southern Arabia (Yemen: Hadramaut) and northern Somalia.

The name *T. arabicus* O. Schwartz was based on three syntypes collected by Dr H. von Wissmann in Yemen in May 1931. All are conspecific but Johnston (1957) introduced confusion as to the correct citation of the type(s), how many there were,

and where they were conserved. This note clarifies matters by designating a lectotype and correcting Johnston's errors.

Echiochilon arabicum (O. Schwartz) I.M. Johnst. in J. Arnold Arbor. 38: 289 (1957). Basionym: *Tetraedrocarpus arabicus* O. Schwartz in Mitt. Allg. Bot. Hamburg 10: 212 (1939). Syntypes: [Yemen] 'In Arabien im Küstengebiet von Hadramaut, (Makalla, *Wissmann* 1241), am Gebirgsabfall hinter Makalla (vor el Lasb, *Wissmann* 1240; im Wadi Himem, *Wissmann* 1234)' (all HBG). Lectotype designated here: *Wissmann* 1240 (HBG) from el Lasb.

In his protologue of *T. arabicus*, Schwartz (1939) cited the three specimens listed above with none indicated as type; all are therefore syntypes. Johnston (1957: 289–290), in his citation of specimens of *E. arabicum* examined (p. 290 para. 2), stated that *Wissmann* 1241 from Mukalla was the type ('G [sic], fragment of Type'). This must be construed as a lectotypification, even if unintentional. In that list, Johnston also cited a photograph of *Wissmann* 1240 from el Lasb (with no statement regarding type status). However, in the final paragraph of his discussion (p. 290), Johnston stated, 'I have had available . . . an excellent photograph of the type of the species, as well as a very generous fragment of the cotype'. Thus, here, Johnston clearly regards *Wissmann* 1240 as the type, not 1241. The same paragraph also confusingly begins, 'The present species was based by Schwartz on two collections'; in it, only *Wissmann* 1240 and 1241 are cited, but in his citation of the basionym *T. arabicus* (p. 289) he correctly listed all three syntypes cited by Schwartz, including *Wissmann* 1234 from Wadi Himem (not 'Himen' as spelled by Johnston; on some modern maps the name appears as Wadi Himam).

I have examined all three syntypes. *Wissmann* 1241 and 1234 are simply labelled *Tetraedrocarpus arabicus* O. Schwartz. An annotation on the top right-hand corner of *Wissmann* 1241 (HBG) testifies to the removal of the fragment that Johnston studied ('1 Probestück für Ivan M. Johnston . . .'); Johnston (1957: 290) acknowledged Dr Walter Domke of the Institut für allgemeine Botanik at Hamburg for sending it to him. Thus, the indication 'G' (today used for Geneva) in Johnston's citation is misleading, although in some of his earlier papers there is evidence that he used 'G' for Gray Herbarium. The sheet's inner packet, which Johnston would not have seen, is merely numbered *Wissmann* 1241.

Wissmann 1240, on the other hand, is annotated 'Typus!' in Schwartz's handwriting, both on its label (which should have been legible on the photograph Johnston received) and, significantly, also on the flap of a small inner packet containing flowers, which Johnston would not have been able to see unless it had been removed for photography with the specimen. Furthermore, unlike the other two specimens, *Wissmann* 1240 bears extensive pencil sketches of dissections and analyses, presumably done by Schwartz as the handwriting is identical to that on the label. That of the nutlets and style appears to be based on *Wissmann* 1241 ('Diese Zeichnung nach W. 1241') but the others are presumably from *Wissmann* 1240. I therefore consider

that Johnston's unintentional lectotypification by *Wissmann* 1241, which would normally have to be followed (*Code Art.* 9.13: Greuter et al., 1994), can be rejected as such, since he later implied that a different specimen (*Wissmann* 1240) was the type. The evidence from the label and packet on *Wissmann* 1240 unambiguously indicates that Schwartz intended that specimen to be the type although his protologue did not indicate this. Accordingly, *Wissmann* 1240 is here designated lectotype of the name *Tetraedrocarpus arabicus* O. Schwartz (and consequently of the genus *Tetraedrocarpus*), and of the combination *Echiochilon arabicum* (O. Schwartz) I.M. Johnst. based upon it.

Acknowledgements

I thank the curator of HBG for enabling me to study the syntype specimens of *Tetraedrocarpus*, which were part of a loan originally sent to E for study by Mr Ian Hedge but subsequently examined by Mr A.G. Miller. The helpful comments of two anonymous referees are appreciated.

References

- GREUTER, W., et al. (eds). (1994). *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (Tokyo Code) adopted by the Fifteenth International Botanical Congress, Yokohama, August–September 1993. Regnum Veg.* 131.
- JOHNSTON, I. M. (1957). Studies in the Boraginaceae, XXIX. *Echiochilon* and related genera. *J. Arnold Arbor.* 38: 255–293.
- SCHWARTZ, O. (1939). Flora des tropischen Arabien. *Mitt. Allg. Bot. Hamburg* 10: 1–393.
- R. R. MILL, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, UK

Elettariopsis unifolia (Gagnep.) M.F. Newman, comb. nov. (Zingiberaceae)

An unidentified member of the Zingiberaceae, accession number 19901449 from Vietnam, flowered for the first time at the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh in May 1995. It matches the holotype specimen of *Amomum unifolium* Gagnep. which comes from a plant grown in the greenhouses of the Muséum de Phanérogamie in Paris. The type specimen consists of two unnumbered and undated sheets, one of them being a drawing of the habit of the living plant. Images of these sheets are held in the Aarhus University Herbarium Graphic Data Base, numbers AAU-GDB 53 and 54.

Gagnepain was unable to say where his material had been collected but he was certain that it came from Vietnam. He supposed that it had been sent to Paris either by Pierre from the south of Vietnam or by Bon from the north. The material in Edinburgh was collected in the south.