

Briggsia Kurzii (Clarke) W. E. Ev. Comb. Nov.

This plant was, in the first instance, described and figured by C. B. Clarke from a fruiting specimen in the Calcutta Herbarium collected by S. Kurz, probably during an excursion made by him to Tonglo near Darjeeling.* It was then (1874) named *Didymocarpus? Kurzii*.†

In September 1875 Mr. Clarke himself visited Tonglo and obtained complete flowering material of the species. As a result he transferred it to the genus *Chirita*, as at that time understood, and added some notes on the floral structure.* "The style at the top," he wrote, "is shortly equally bifid, not unilateral, as heretofore insisted on for *Chirita*. The corolla is a beautiful yellow with orange-brown spots in the throat, much resembling that of *Dichrotrichum Griffithii*‡ in my figure, but longer. There are four stamens, as usual, in *Chirita*, and generally a prominent rudiment of the fifth."

Eight years later, in September 1883, Mr. Clarke published his Monograph of the Cyrtandreae.§ There he definitely restricted the genus *Chirita* to species with only two fertile stamens and instituted, amongst others, the genus *Didissandra* to include forms with four more or less didynamous fertile stamens. Despite this, he still included the species now under discussion in *Chirita* without comment, no reference whatever being made to its androecium in his augmented latin diagnosis.|| For this reason, no doubt, its right to a place in *Chirita* has not since been questioned, so far as I am aware.

Recently, while going through some material collected by Ribu and Rhomoo, I was struck by the remarkable similarity existing between fruiting specimens of *Chirita Kurzii* from Tonglo, included therein, and examples of the Chinese *Briggsia amabilis* Craib,** in like condition. This similarity was noticeable in all points, even the seed being apparently identical. Dissection of a single corolla from the only flowering plant of the supposed *Chirita* available at that time showed that Mr. Clarke's account of the stamens was substantially correct and that the species was almost certainly a *Briggsia*, very nearly allied to, if not actually identical with, *B. amabilis* Craib.

Since then I have had the privilege of examining all the material

* See Journ. Linn. Soc. (Bot.), xv, p. 145 (1876).

† Comm. et Cyrt. Beng. (1874), t. 66.

‡ = *Loxostigma Griffithii* C. B. Clarke, nom. nov. in A. DC. Monog. Phan., v, p. 60 (1883). The resemblance in floral structure referred to above, particularly as regards the androecium, is most remarkable.

§ In A. DC. Monog. Phan., v (1883).

|| Loc. cit. p. 117.

** Described under the name *Didissandra amabilis* Diels in Notes, Roy. Bot. Gard. Edin., v, p. 224 (1912).

of *Chirita Kurzii* in the Kew Herbarium and have reached the following conclusions:—

1. The species is an undoubted *Briggsia* and should be transferred to that genus under the name *Briggsia Kurzii* (C. B. Clarke) W. E. Ev.

2. It is very closely allied to the Chinese *B. amabilis* Craib, found in Yunnan and Szechuan. Indeed the latter appears to me to be merely a geographical "modification" of the same species, usually of shorter and more slender stature, its upper parts and especially the inflorescence generally rather less hairy, with as a rule fewer flowers and these having perhaps relatively wider corollas.

3. A fragmentary specimen from Upper Burma, collected by R. Farrer and named by Professor Craib *B. amabilis*, exists in the Edinburgh Herbarium. I am unable to separate this from small examples of *B. Kurzii* obtained in Sikkim.

4. Though Sikkim specimens of *B. Kurzii* are frequently taller, stouter, more hairy above and more floriferous this is by no means always the case and there are specimens both at Kew and Edinburgh which do not appreciably differ in these respects from the authentic Burmese and even Chinese specimens of *B. amabilis*.

5. I am inclined to think that such differences as those referred to are no more than might be expected to result from the known climatic conditions existing in the respective habitats of the Sikkim and Chinese forms. Such differences are hardly likely to prove sufficiently fixed to allow of their use as specific distinctions, and it seems probable that the intergradation shown in the comparatively few specimens obtainable for study at the present time will be more fully seen in a more complete range of specimens when that becomes available.

6. While, therefore, I hesitate at this stage to place *B. amabilis* Craib as a definite synonym of *B. Kurzii*, I strongly suspect that it will ultimately have to be so regarded.

W. EDGAR EVANS.

NOTE ON COLURIA LONGIFOLIA MAXIM.

In my paper on The Genus *Coluria* published in No. LXXI of these Notes it was pointed out that, owing to insufficient description, the affinity of the above species would remain uncertain until authentic material could be examined.

I have now seen some of the specimens collected by Przewalski in Kansu. These were kindly sent from the Leningrad Herbarium, and consequently may be regarded as authentic. They show that *Coluria longifolia* Maxim. is conspecific with *C. elegans* Cardot, so that the latter name now becomes a synonym of the former.

W. EDGAR EVANS.