Studies in the Gesneriaceae of the Old World

II.—Types and Lectotypes of Certain Genera and Groups of Lower Rank

BY

B. L. BURTT

In any discussion of the genera of a particular group of plants it is clearly essential that the connotation of each name mentioned be clearly understood. This only obtains when the type species, or lectotype, of the group in question is known. In such a family as *Gesneriaceae* it is of paramount importance, for here the circumscription of the genera is at present very uncertain, and many of them were originally based on a mixed assemblage of species, none of which was specified as the type. It therefore seems desirable to present a list of types and lectotypes at an early stage in this series of studies. That now given is, of course, by no means complete, but it will serve to give precision to the use of the names which will recur most frequently. It is intended to be complete for the genera which are considered, and I shall be glad to know of any subgenera, sections or series which I have omitted. The synonymy given is, generally speaking, only that which is nomenclatural, not that depending on taxonomic determinations.

It may be objected that the determination of these lectotypes is premature and should have been withheld pending complete revisions of the genera concerned. It seems preferable, however, to take the straightforward decisions without delay, before any further confusions can arise. Where the complexities of the problem enjoin caution, as in *Didymocarpus* section *Didymanthus*, the final decision has been postponed.

One point must be mentioned concerning the form of citation used for the authorities for genera and species. For a long time the Rules of Nomenclature have made it clear that when a name is proposed in manuscript by one author (A) and taken up and published by another (B), the full citation should be in the form "A ex B," but that for brevity it is perfectly correct to cite only B. It is incorrect to cite only A. Despite this clear and commonsense rule, all working taxonomists know that brevity is all too commonly attained by dropping "ex B." In an attempt to avoid this I have adopted the form of citation "[A ex] B." When there has been a change in the type specimen (when, that is, the published decription was not based on the specimen to which the manuscript name was originally applied) it seems preferable to drop the citation of author A altogether. A good example of this is *Boea amplexicaulis* C. B. Cl. (see p. 207).

I am aware that the use of square brackets in such citations as "[A ex] B" finds no sanction in the International Code of Nomenclature. Citation in this form is, however, recommended when it is considered useful to refer to an author before the starting date of the nomenclature of the group concerned. *Lupinus* [Tournef.] L. is given as an example, which may alternatively be written *Lupinus* Tournef. ex L. The two cases are analogous. In a citation such as *Didymocarpus oblongus* [Wall. ex] D. Don and in *Lupinus*

[Tournef.] L. the authors whose names appear in square brackets did not effect nomenclaturally valid publication of the names concerned. I, therefore, consider that citations in this form are quite justified.

In conformity with Recommendation 83A of the International Code, I take such names as *Didymocarpus*, *Streptocarpus* and *Ancylostemon* as being masculine in gender. In defiance of Recommendation 60H, however, I do not show the original form of every name cited. Similarly, having decided to adopt the spelling *Boea* for that genus and the names derived from it (see footnote, p. 194), I do not also cite the original spelling if that was different. To follow Recommendation 60H in every case would be to render an already cumbersome paper intolerable.

In addition to the usual abbreviations sanctioned by custom two repeatedly recurring references are given in shortened form. They are:—

C.B.Cl., Mon.=C. B. Clarke, Cyrtandraceae in A. & C. De Candolle, Monographiae Phanerogamarum, v, 1–303 (1883).

K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam.=K. Fritsch, Gesneriaceae, in Engler & Prantl, Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien, iv Theil, Abteilung 3B, 133–185 (1895).

ANCYLOSTEMON Craib in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. xi, 233, 266 (1919).

Lectotype: A. CONCAVUS Craib in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. xi, 234, 266 (1919).

Of the five species referred to this genus by Craib, two were described by him in detail. Either might well be taken as the type and *A. concavus* is now chosen.

BOEA † [Commerson ex] Lam. Encycl. Méth. i, 401 (1785).

Holotype: B. MAGELLANICA Lam. Encycl. Méth. i, 401 (1785).

Syn.: *B. Commersonii* R. Br. in Benn. Pl. Jav. Rar. 120 (1840)—*nomen illegitimum.*

This species comes from the Solomon Islands–New Guinea area, thus gainsaying the unfortunate specific epithet given to it by Lamarck. It is not, however, permissible to change this.

Sect. SUBACAULES K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 150 (1895).

Lectotype: B. MAGELLANICA Lam.

Fritsch attributes the section *Subacaules* to C. B. Clarke, but Clarke had no formal sections in *Boea;* he simply grouped the species under three heads: * *Caules elongati;* ** *Caules abbreviati;* *** *Subacaules.* As *B. magellanica*, the type of the genus, is included in *Subacaules* it should certainly be adopted as the lectotype of the section. It is to this section, in the current classification, that the genus *Dorcoceras* Bunge is referred. Its holotype is *D. hygrometricum* Bunge, which becomes *Boea hygrometrica* (Bunge) R. Br.

Sect. CAULESCENTES K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 150 (1895).

Lectotype: B. MULTIFLORA R. Br. in Benn. Pl. Jav. Rar. 120 (1840).

Syn.: *Didymocarpus multiflorus* Wall. List, No. 793 (1828)—*nomen nudum.*

---

† The spelling of this name has caused considerable trouble. Clarke records that Commerson originally wrote "*Bea*," naming the genus after M. le Beau. However, it was first published by Lamarck in the form *Boea*, and in this paper I have retained that spelling both for the genus and for all its compounds in other generic and sectional names (e.g. *Boeopsis*, *Boeoides*, *Phylloboea*).

This section comprises the groups headed *Caules elongati* and *Caules abbreviati* by Clarke. Fritsch mentions *B. multiflora* as the best known species.

BRIGGSIA Craib in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. xi, 236, 262 (1919).

Lectotype: B. LONGIFOLIA Craib in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. xi, 238, 264 (1919).

No type species of this genus was indicated by Craib. It is clear from his generic description that the caulescent species (*B. amabilis* and *B. Cavaleriei*) and those with glabrous leaves (*B. longipes*, *B. Mihieri* and *B. Fritschii*) were regarded as somewhat anomalous. Of the remaining eight species some are very rare or unusual in one respect or another and the choice may reasonably be restricted to *B. longifolia*, *B. muscicola* or *B. Forrestii*. Of these the first two are very closely allied and *B. longifolia* was one of the species of which Craib gave a detailed description. It therefore seems a very suitable species to be taken as the lectotype of the genus.

CHIRITA [Buch.-Ham. ex] D. Don, Prodr. Fl. Nepal. 89 (1825).

Syn.: *Roettlera* subgen. *Chirita* (D. Don) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).

Didymocarpus subgen. *Chirita* (D. Don) Chun in Sunyatsenia, vi, 290 (1946).*

Lectotype: C. URTICIFOLIA [Buch.-Ham. ex] D. Don, Prodr. Fl. Nepal. 90 (1825).

Syn.: *Roettlera urticifolia* (D. Don) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 477 (1891).

When published by D. Don the genus included *C. bifolia* D. Don and *C. pumila* D. Don as well as *C. urticifolia*. The last-named species was the only one that had been known to Buchanan-Hamilton, and it is therefore natural to take this as the lectotype of the genus.

Sect. EUCHIRITA C.B.Cl. Mon. 111 (1883).

Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Euchirita* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam 148 (1895).

Didymocarpus sect. *Euchirita* (C.B.Cl.) Chun in Sunyatsenia, vi, 294 (1946).

Lectotype: C. URTICIFOLIA [Buch.-Ham. ex] D. Don.

Sect. LIEBIGIA (Endl.) C.B.Cl. Mon. 122 (1883).

Syn.: *Tromsdorffia* Blume, Bijdr. xiv, 762 (1826)—non *Trommsdorffia* Bernh. (1800) nec Mart. (1826).

Liebigia Endl. Gen. Pl. Suppl. i, 407 (1840).

Morstdorffia Steud. Nomencl. ed. 2, ii, 161 (1841).

Roettlera sect. *Liebigia* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).

Holotype: C. BLUMEI C.B.Cl. Mon. 122 (1883).

Syn.: *Tromsdorffia speciosa* Blume, Bijdr. xiv, 763 (1826)—non *Chirita speciosa* Kurz (1873).

Morstdorffia speciosa (Bl.) Steud. Nomencl. ed. 2 , ii, 161 (1841).

Liebigia speciosa (Bl.) DC. Prodr. ix, 259 (1845).

---

* The combinations for subgenera and sections here attributed to W. Y. Chun were not formally made by him. For instance, Chun wrote "*Didymocarpus* subgen. *Chirita* (Hamilt.) Fritsch," although Fritsch used the generic name *Roettlera*, not *Didymocarpus*. Similarly Chun wrote "section *Euchirita* C. B. Clarke" under *Didymocarpus* although Clarke placed the section in the genus *Chirita*. However, it seems best to accept these statements as effective transfers.

Sect. BILABIUM (Miq.) C.B.Cl. Mon. 126 (1883).
Syn.: *Bilabium* Miq. Fl. Ind. Bat. ii, 730 (1856).
Roettlera sect. *Bilabium* (Miq.) K. Fritsch, Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).
Holotype: **C. limans** (Miq.) B. L. Burtt, **comb. nov.**
Syn.: *Bilabium limans* Miq. Fl. Ind. Bat. ii, 730 (1856).
Chirita Bilabium C.B.Cl. Mon. 127 (1883)—*nomen illegitimum*.
Roettlera limans (Miq.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).
Sect. MICROCHIRITA C.B.Cl. Mon. 127 (1883).
Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Microchirita* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).
Didymocarpus sect. *Microchirita* (C.B.Cl.) Chun in Sunyatsenia, vi, 290 (1946).
Lectotype: C. HAMOSA R. Br. in Benn. Pl. Jav. Rar. 117 (1840).
Syn.: *Didymocarpus hamosus* Wall. List, No. 788 (1828)—*nomen nudum*.
Roettlera hamosa (R. Br.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 475 (1891).

Four species were referred to section *Microchirita* by C. B. Clarke, *C. hamosa* being easily the best known of them. It has all the diagnostic characters of the section and is in every way suitable as the lectotype. The other original species of the section were *C. caerulea* R. Br., *C. fusca* C.B.Cl., and *C. humilis* Miq.

Sect. GIBBOSACCUS C.B.Cl. Mon. 130 (1883).
Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Gibbosaccus* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).
Holotype: C. SINENSIS Lindl. in Bot. Reg. t. 49 (1844).
Syn.: *Roettlera sinensis* (Lindl.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 477 (1891).

CHLAMYDOBOEA Stapf in Kew Bull. 1913, 354.
Holotype: C. SINENSIS (Oliv.) Stapf in Kew Bull. 1913, 355.
Syn.: *Phylloboea sinensis* Oliv. in Hook. Ic. Pl. xviii, tab. 1721 (1887).

DICHILOBOEA Stapf in Kew Bull. 1913, 356.
Lectotype: D. BIRMANICA (Craib) Stapf in Kew Bull. 1913, 357.
Syn.: *Boea birmanica* Craib in Kew Bull. 1913, 414.

Stapf established the genus *Dichiloboea* for two species, *D. birmanica* and *D. speciosa* (Ridl.) Stapf (*Phylloboea speciosa* Ridl. in Journ. Linn. Soc. London, Bot. xxxii, 522, 1895). The species are undoubtedly congeneric, and I simply propose the better known of the two as the lectotype of the genus.

DIDISSANDA C.B.Cl. Mon. 65 (1883)—nomen ad conservandum propositum.*
Lectotype: D. FRUTESCENS (Jack) C.B.Cl. Mon. 67 (1883).
Syn.: *Didymocarpus frutescens* Jack, Malay, Misc. i (5), 5 (1820).
Henckelia frutescens (Jack) Spreng. Syst. Veg. iv, Cur. Post. 13 (1827).

---

* *Didissandra* has been proposed for conservation against *Ellobum* Bl. (1826), a genus which was for long thought to be scrophulariaceous and a synonym of *Vandellia*. Rediscovery of the type specimens at Leiden, however, has shown it to be a species of *Didissandra* and conservation of *Didissandra* is therefore necessary (see Flora Malesiana Bulletin, No. 3, 72: 1948).

The reasons for taking *D. frutescens* as the lectotype of this genus have been set out in an earlier article (see B. L. Burtt in Gard. Chron. ser. 3, cxxii, 204, 212: 1947); here it is sufficient to repeat that the restricted concept of the genus was effectively proposed in 1905 by H. N. Ridley, some fourteen years prior to W. G. Craib's action in limiting the name to section *Boeoides*.

Sect. CYRTANDROIDES C.B.Cl. Mon. 66 (1883).

Holotype: D. FRUTESCENS (Jack) C.B.Cl.

It will be noticed that there is nothing in the name of this section to indicate that it is the type section of the genus. There is no reason why this should be so. Under the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, as amended at Stockholm in 1950, the name of the *subgenus* which includes the type species of the genus is simply a repetition of the generic name without the citation of any authority (for example, *Didissandra* C.B.Cl. subgen. *Didissandra*). But this does not apply at the level of the section; here the generic name *may* be repeated, but only under the normal rule of priority as in the case of *Paraboea* C.B.Cl. sect. *Paraboea* (C.B.Cl.) B. L. Burtt (see p. 206). In other genera we find such names as *Didymocarpus* sect. *Eudidymocarpus* or *Chirita* sect. *Euchirita*, but these are formed according to the whim of the author proposing them not according to any set rule.

Sect. BOEOIDES (Benth.) C.B.Cl. Mon. 66 (1883).

See under *Didymocarpus* sect. *Boeoides* Benth. (p. 199).

Sect. ELONGATAE C.B.Cl. Mon. 67 (1883).

Syn.: *Didissandra* sect. *Eudidissandra* K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 146 (1895) —*nomen illegitimum*.

Lectotype: D. ELONGATA (Jack) C.B.Cl. Mon. 67 (1883).

Syn.: *Didymocarpus elongatus* Jack in Trans. Linn. Soc. xiv, 37 (1823).
Henckelia elongata (Jack) Spreng. Syst. Veg. iv, Cur. Post. 13 (1827).

There seem to be no objections to the obvious course of taking *D. elongata* as the lectotype of the section to which it gives its name. The other species included here by Clarke were *D. Sprengeli* C.B.Cl. and *D.? triflora* C.B.Cl.

It is unfortunate, but in no way contrary to the Rules, that Clarke included this adjectival sectional name amongst others substantival in form. Fritsch's change of name is therefore illegitimate.

Sect. STILPNOTRIX C.B.Cl. Mon. 69 (1883).

Lectotype: D. ORNATA C.B.Cl. Mon. 69 et tab. 8 (1883).

D. ornata is the better known of the two species referred to this section by Clarke. The other species is *D. rufa* C.B.Cl. Ridley has taken the view that this section should be excluded from *Didissandra* (see Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 2: 1905), and it is not unlikely that he is correct; but as no positive action has yet been taken it is best to defer any change until the limits of *Didissandra* have been studied in detail.

Sect. CHIRITOIDES K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 46 (1895).

Holotype: *D. sesquifolia* C.B.Cl. in Hook. Ic. Pl. xviii, tab. 1797 (1888).

Sect. SPECIOSAE Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 20 (1905).

Lectotype: To be designated later.

Ridley placed eleven species in this section, all of them having been described by himself subsequent to Clarke's account of the genus. Ridley remarks in his introductory matter "*Didissandra* thus as regards the Malay Peninsula includes two sections, which might almost be made distinct

genera: the section *Cyrtandroides* (Clarke) tall shrubby plants with distant leaves and flowers in the lower axils, two species; and the very distinct section *Speciosae* with eleven species of small shrublets with crowded leaves and large and showy blue, white or yellow flowers, a very distinct group of which I have not seen any species even from Sumatra and Borneo." Nevertheless, in his Flora of the Malay Peninsula (ii, 501, 1923) Ridley dropped the use of sectional names in *Didissandra*. The material immediately available to me is insufficient to justify the choice of a type for the section at present.

DIDYMOCARPUS Wall. in Edinb. Phil. Journ. i, 378 (1819)—*nomen conservandum*.*

Syn.: *Roettlera* subgen. *Didymocarpus* (Wall.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 146 (1895).

Lectotype: D. OBLONGUS [Wall. ex] D. Don, Prodr. Fl. Nep. 123 (1825).

Syn.: *Roettlera oblonga* (D. Don) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).

Henckelia oblonga (D. Don) Spreng. Syst. Veg. iv, Cur. Post 13 (1827).

No species were mentioned by name when the genus *Didymocarpus* was originally established by Wallich, and it is therefore necessary to seek a lectotype amongst those described later. The first species actually named in the genus were the Malayan ones published by William Jack (in Trans. Linn. Soc. London xiv, 32: 1823). These, however, are not the species mentioned by Wallich, and they are not eligible for consideration as possible lectotypes. Two years later D. Don's Prodromus Florae Nepalensis was published, and in it seven species were named and described. All were based on Wallich's material, but it is clear that those attributed to "Wallich in litt." have the greatest claim to consideration as possible lectotypes. The botanical characters give no cause for choosing one rather than another, and my first choice fell on *D. aromatica*, by reason of the extended description and the remarks concerning it given by Wallich eleven years after he had originally published the genus and six years after Don had described the species. Wallich said (Pl. As. Rar. ii, 34: 1831), "Thirteen years ago I forwarded a short account of this plant and of the genus to which it belongs to Dr. Hamilton, who inserted it in the first volume of the Edinburgh Philosophical Journal, published in 1819." In fact, Wallich heads his article with the reference "*Didymocarpus aromatica*, Wall. in Edinburgh Philosophical Journal, vol. 1, p. 378." although, as already noted, no species were actually mentioned in print at that time. By contrast *D. oblongus* is given a comparatively brief description by Wallich, and no discussion. There are thus, at first sight, good reasons for accepting *D. aromaticus* Wall. as lectotype of the genus.

However, the original publication of the genus shows quite clearly that it is not based solely on this species which was later named *D. aromaticus:* it is evident that several species were known from the first. Due weight can therefore be given to any objections there may be in the choice of *D. aromaticus:* and in fact there are such serious objections. It appears that Don had a mixture of two species under the name *D. aromaticus;* the plant we now know as that species and *D. subalternans;* further Wallich himself included

* The *nomen rejiciendum* is *Roettlera* Vahl, and therefore *Henckelia* Spreng. (*Roettlera* Vahl, non Willd.) is also to be rejected unless it is recognised as a genus distinct from *Didymocarpus*. See under section *Orthoboea* (p. 200).

fruiting material of *D. macrophyllus* on his plate of *D. aromaticus* (Pl. As. Rar. ii, t. 140: 1830), and subsequently C. B. Clarke (Comm. et Cyrt. Bengal, t. 63: 1874) did exactly the same thing. It is clearly inconvenient to choose as the type of a genus a species whose early descriptions are so full of confusion. It is infinitely preferable to designate *D. oblongus*, a species free from any such objection, as the lectotype. This is accordingly the course adopted.

The sectional classification of *Didymocarpus* is attributable to four authors, Bentham, Clarke, Ridley and Handel-Mazzetti, and it is convenient to treat their contributions separately.

Sections proposed by Bentham

Sect. BOEOIDES Benth. in Benth. & Hook, fil. Gen. Pl. ii, 1022 (1876).

Syn.: *Didissandra* sect. *Boeoides* (Benth.) C.B.Cl. Mon. 66 (1883).

Lectotype: CORALLODISCUS LANUGINOSUS (DC.) B. L. Burtt in Gard. Chron. 3 ser. cxxii, 212 (1947).

Syn.: *Didymocarpus lanuginosus* [Wall. ex.] DC. Prodr. ix, 268 (1845).
Didissandra lanuginosa (DC.) C.B.Cl. Mon. 66 (1883).

This is the group which is now placed in the genus *Corallodiscus* Batalin (see Burtt in Gard. Chron. 3 ser. cxxii, 204, 212: 1947), but it has not yet been found necessary to transfer the sectional name.

Bentham associated *Didymocarpus Auricula* S. Moore with *D. lanuginosus* in this section, but *D. auricula* has four free stamens and was made the type species of *Oreocharis* sect. *Stomactin* by C. B. Clarke.

Sect. EUDIDYMOCARPUS Benth. in Benth. & Hook. fil. Gen. Pl. ii, 1022 (1876).

Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Eudidymocarpus* (Benth.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 146 (1895).

Lectotype: D. OBLONGUS [Wall. ex.] D. Don.

Bentham did not enumerate the species of this section, but he quoted Wallich's illustration of *D. oblongus* and all the arguments for taking this species as lectotype of the genus are applicable under section *Eudidymocarpus*.

Sect. HETEROBOEA Benth. in Benth. & Hook. fil. Gen. Pl. ii, 1022 (1876).

Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Heteroboea* (Benth.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).

Lectotype: D. CRINITUS Jack, Malay. Misc. i (5), 1 (1820).

Syn.: *Roettlera crinita* (Jack) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).
Henckelia crinita (Jack) Spreng. Syst. Veg. iv, Cur. Post. 13 (1827).

Bentham placed in this section "*D. reptans*, Jack, et *D. corchorifolius*, Wall. foliis oppositis: *D. crinitus*, Jack (Bot. Mag. t. 4554, in Fl. des Serres, t. 631 repetita) foliis alternis floribus flavescentibus cum specie affini a Cuming sub n. 2329 et Griffithis lecta et verosimiliter *D. Kurzii*, Clarke, Comm. et Cyrt, Beng. t. 66."

D. reptans was placed in a distinct section, *Reptantes*, by Ridley (see p. 204). *D. corchorifolius* was placed in section *Didymanthus* by C. B. Clarke. Ridley placed it first in section *Elatae* (see p. 204), later in section *Eudidymocarpus*.

D. crinitus Jack has been retained in section *Heteroboea* by later authors, and, there being no botanical objection, it is accordingly proposed as lectotype. One of Jack's specimens of this plant is preserved in the herbarium of the Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh, and a photograph of it has recently been

published by Dr. E. D. Merrill in his article, "William Jack's Genera and Species of Malaysian Plants" (in Journ. Arn. Arb. xxxiii, 199–251: 1952).

The species mentioned by Bentham as being collected by Cuming and Griffith is *D. platypus* C.B.Cl., a close ally of *D. crinitus*. *D. Kurzii* C.B.Cl. is a tetrandrous plant and is now known as *Briggsia Kurzii* (C.B.Cl.) W. E. Evans (see Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. xvi, 133: 1928).

Sect. ORTHOBOEA Benth. in Benth. & Hook. fil. Gen. Pl. ii, 1022 (1876).

Syn.: *Roettlera* Vahl, Enum. i, 88 (1805)—non Willd. (1797).

Henckelia Spreng. Anleit. ed. 2, ii, 402 (1817).

Roettlera sect. *Orthoboea* (Benth.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).

Lectotype: D. TOMENTOSUS Wight, Ic. Pl. Ind. Or. iv, pt. 2, 10, tab. 1349 (1850); C.B.Cl. in Hook. fil. Fl. Brit. Ind. iv, 353 (1884); Gamble, Fl. Madras ii, 989 (1924).

Syn.: *Roettlera incana* Vahl, Enum. i, 88 (1805)—non *Didymocarpus incanus* (R. Br.) C.B.Cl. (1883).

Henckelia incana (Vahl) Spreng. Anleit, ed. 2, ii, 402 (1817).

Didymocarpus Rottlerianus Wall. List, No. 788 (1828)—*nomen illegitimum*.

D. Rottlerianus var. *tomentosus* (Wight) C.B.Cl. Mon. 101 (1883).

At first sight it seemed that there was no difficulty in the way of adopting *Didymocarpus Rottlerianus* as the lectotype of the section *Orthoboea*. At the same time one would have recognized that the section might well be accorded generic rank when *Didymocarpus* is revised and that it would then be called *Henckelia*, with the same species as the generic type under the name *Henckelia incana*.

Unfortunately it is not as simple as that. *Didymocarpus Rottlerianus* was not a *nomen nudum* in Wallich's list, as were most of his names. The synonym *Roettlera incana* is quoted, and this is enough to validate the name *D. Rottlerianus* and, under our modern retroactive rule, to render it illegitimate, for at that time there was no impediment to the use of the epithet *incanus* under *Didymocarpus*. Later the combination *Didymocarpus incanus* was used by C. B. Clarke for quite a different plant (*Loxocarpus incanus* R. Br.), and it is therefore not now available for the *Roettlera*.

Further complications came to light as soon as an attempt was made to determine the correct name of *D. Rottlerianus* Wall. Most authors have implicitly taken the specimen in the Wallich herbarium (No. 788) as the type of *D. Rottlerianus*, and J. S. Gamble (in Kew Bull. 1924, 237) has explicitly stated that this is so. As already mentioned *D. Rottlerianus* is validated by the synonym *Roettlera incana* Vahl, and it is Røttler's specimen, described by Vahl, that is its type.

When Clarke proposed *D. Rottlerianus* var. β *Wightii* and cited *Roettlera incana* as a synonym thereof, he was in effect making the type of the species into the variety. Subsequently Gamble decided that var. *Wightii* was better regarded as a distinct species and made the new combination *D. Wightii* (C.B.Cl.) Gamble.

Through the courtesy of the Director of the Botanical Museum, Copenhagen, I have been able to examine Røttler's specimen described by Vahl as *Roettlera incana*. This has been determined by Kraenzlin as "Didymocarpus Rottleriana Wall. var. α tomentosa Wight." I must concur with this deter-

mination; the plant is not *D. Wightii* Gamble but what we now call *D. tomentosus* Wight, and this is the correct name for *D. Rottlerianus* (=*Roettlera incana*) if the plant is retained in *Didymocarpus*. It must be emphasised, however, that *D. Rottlerianus* Wall. and *D. tomentosus* Wight are not nomenclatural synonyms. They have different type specimens: *D. Rottlerianus* and *Roettlera incana* are based on Røttler's specimen, *D. tomentosus* on Wight's. The citation of *D. tomentosus* as lectotype of *Didymocarpus* sect. *Orthoboea* depends on the taxonomic identification of these two specimens.

This elucidation of the lectotype of *Didymocarpus* sect. *Orthoboea* leaves a subsidiary problem unsolved: what is the name for the Wallich plant that has for so long been called *D. Rottlerianus*? This plant appears to have been known for some one hundred and thirty years without any name having been proposed for it: it may therefore be aptly known as *D. innominatus*, the name being validated by reference to C. B. Clarke's specific description and the type being Wallich's plant (No. 788) in the Kew herbarium.

If we accept Gamble's view that the four varieties placed under *D. Rottlerianus* by Clarke are all distinct species they should be known as follows:—

D. innominatus B. L. Burtt, **nom. nov.**

Syn.: "*D. Rottlerianus* Wall." C.B.Cl. Mon. 101 (1883)—excl. vars.—et in Hook. fil. Fl. Brit. Ind. iv, 353 (1884)—excl. var.; Gamble, Fl. Madras ii, 989 (1924).

D. WIGHTII (C.B.Cl.) Gamble, Fl. Madras ii, 989 (1924).

Syn.: *D. Rottlerianus* var. β *Wightii* C.B.Cl. Mon. 101 (1883) et in Hook. fil. Fl. Brit. Ind. iv, 353 (1884).

D. TOMENTOSUS Wight—see p. 200.

D. GAMBLEANUS C. E. C. Fischer in Kew Bull. 1938, 36.

Syn.: *D. Rottlerianus* var. *lanuginosus* C.B.Cl. Mon. 102 (1883).

D. tomentosus var. *lanuginosus* C.B.Cl. in Hook. fil. Fl. Brit. Ind. iv, 353 (1884).

D. lanuginosus [Wight MSS. olim] Gamble, Fl. Madras ii, 989 (1924)—non *D. lanuginosus* [Wall. ex] DC. Prodr. ix, 268 (1845).

Sect. LOXOCARPUS (R. Br.) Benth. in Benth. & Hook. fil. Gen. Pl. ii, 1022 (1876).

Syn.: *Loxocarpus* R. Br. in Benn. Pl. Jav. Rar. 115, 120 (1840).

Roettlera sect. *Loxocarpus* (R. Br.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).

Holotype: D. INCANUS (R. Br.) C.B.Cl. Mon. 98 (1883).

Syn.: *Loxocarpus incanus* R. Br. in Benn. Pl. Jav. Rar. 120 (1840).

Loxonia? alata Wall. List, No. 809 (1828)—*nomen nudum*.

Roettlera alata O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).

Loxocarpus has been accepted as a distinct genus by Ridley (Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 526: 1923). It is listed here as a section of *Didymocarpus* without prejudice to its eventual status. Its affinity is with *Didymocarpus* sect. *Orthoboea* rather than with sect. *Eudidymocarpus*, and it should therefore be noted that the name *Henckelia* Spreng. (1817), which will be the generic name of section *Orthoboea* if it is segregated from *Didymocarpus*, antedates *Loxocarpus*.

Sections proposed by C. B. Clarke

Sect. MONOPHYLLOIDES C.B.Cl. Mon. 82 (1883).

Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Monophylloides* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 147 (1895).

Holotype: D. PYGMAEUS C.B.Cl. Mon. 82 (1883).

Syn.: *Roettlera pygmaea* (C.B.Cl.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).

Sect. DIDYMANTHUS C.B.Cl. Mon. 82 (1883).

Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Didymanthus* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 147 (1895).

Lectotype: Either *D. serratus* R. Br. or *D. barbinervius* C.B.Cl.; to be decided after further study.

The nine species placed in this section by C. B. Clarke may be annotated as follows:—

1. *D. mollis* Wall.—flowers not known to Clarke.
2. *D. paucinervius* C.B.Cl.—flowers not known to Clarke.
3. *D. cordatus* Jack=*Paraboea cordata* (Jack) Ridley.
4. *D. serratus* R. Br. Sumatra? Only one specimen known.
5. *D. rufipes* C.B.Cl. Doubtfully placed in this section. Clarke noted that it might be closer to *Paraboea*.
6. *D. corchorifolia* Wall. Ridley (Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 2, 3, 28, 31: 1905) mentioned this as an aberrant species in the genus, largely on account of the closed, personate, corolla-mouth, and placed it in his section *Elatae*. I propose it as the lectotype of this section (see p. 204).
7. *D. barbinervius* C.B.Cl. Burma. Only one specimen known.
8. *D. corniculatus* Jack. Not seen by C. B. Clarke.
9. *D. longipes* C.B.Cl. Transferred to section *Boeopsis* by Ridley (Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 508, 521: 1923).

Considering only Clarke's own work, in the first place, I think it will be agreed that Nos. 1, 2, 5 and 8 in the foregoing list scarcely qualify as candidates for choice as the type.

It is unfortunate that Ridley only dealt with three of Clarke's nine species in this section, and that he transferred all these three elsewhere. However, I find no cogent reason for nominating any of these three species as lectotype of the section, and Ridley's action in excluding them from it may be accepted. It is not possible to form a precise idea of Ridlay's concept of section *Didymanthus* as his diagnosis of it is very brief. He simply says (Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 506: 1923), "Herbs with distant pairs of leaves; flowers cymose axillary usually on long peduncles; bracts very inconspicuous."

The present conclusion is that the lectotype of section *Didymanthus* must be either the Sumatran *D. serratus* R. Br. or the Burmese *D. barbinervius*. It is not feasible to choose between them until they can be re-examined side by side, together with a representative set of the twenty species that Ridley refers to this section. The final choice is therefore deferred.

Sect. KOMPSOBOEA C.B.Cl. Mon. 87 (1883).

Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Kompsoboea* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 147 (1895).

Lectotype: D. KOMPSOBOEA C.B.Cl. Mon. 92 et tab. x (1883).

Syn.: *Roettlera kompsoboea* (C.B.Cl.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).

Ridley (Journ. Linn. Soc. London, Bot. xxxii, 510) regarded *D. kompsoboea* as anomalous amongst the other species referred to this section by Clarke. He preferred to place it in section *Heteroboea* next to *D. crinitus*. Having placed *D. kompsoboea* elsewhere, Ridley, quite properly dropped the sectional name *Kompsoboea* altogether. It certainly seems undesirable to take any other

species as the lectotype of the section, for the link between specific and sectional names is too close and is reinforced by the fact that *D. kompsoboea* was the only species of the section illustrated by Clarke.

Sect. PARABOEA C.B.Cl. Mon. 105 (1883).

See below under *Paraboea* (p. 206).

Sect. HOVA C.B.Cl. Mon. 108 (1883).

Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Hova* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).

Holotype: D. MADAGASCARICUS C.B.Cl. Mon. 108 et tab. xi (1883).

Syn.: *Roettlera madagascarica* (C.B.Cl.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).

Sections proposed by Ridley

In considering the sections proposed by Ridley it is vital to remember that this author published two independent classifications of the genus as represented in the Malay Peninsula. That set out in the earlier paper, The Gesneriaceae of the Malay Peninsula (in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv: 1905) differed considerably from that eventually used in the Flora of the Malay Peninsula (1923). Ridley's sectional diagnoses are so brief that it has been thought useful to include them.

Sect. ACAULES Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 31 (1905).

Lectotype: D. LACUNOSUS Hook. fil. in Bot. Mag. tab. 7236 (1892).

Diagnosis: "Stemless or nearly so. Leaves crowded."

Ridley placed six species in this section in 1905, but in 1923 he abandoned it altogether, placing two of the species in section *Eudidymocarpus*, which he had not previously recognised from the Malay Peninsula, and four in a new section *Boeopsis*.

The fact that the sectional name *Acaules* was not retained for the four species (*D. heterophyllus* Ridley, *D. perditus* Ridley, *D. pumilus* Ridley, and *D. puncticulatus* Ridley) suggests very strongly that Ridley regarded one of the two species transferred to section *Eudidymocarpus* as the type of the section. No proof can be given of this view, but it receives some endorsement from the fact that one of these two species, *D. lacunosus* Hook. fil., was the best known of the six original species of section *Acaules*. It is accordingly adopted as lectotype of the section.

This interpretation of the section *Acaules* is also in harmony with an important principle underlying the determination of types. It is that types should, where possible, be chosen in such a way as to avoid both unnecessary changes of name and the likelihood of unnecessary creation of names at a later date. By adopting *D. lacunosus* to typify section *Acaules* we keep that sectional name available for it if, as is highly probable, later workers fail to concur in its inclusion in section *Eudidymocarpus*. Had the type been chosen from one of the four species referred to *Boeopsis*, then *Boeopsis* would have become an illegitimate name and would have had to be called *Acaules*, and one potentially useful name would have been lost.

Sect. BOEOPSIS Ridley, Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 508 (1923).

Lectotype: D. LONGIPES C.B.Cl. Mon. 86 (1883).

Syn.: *Roettlera longipes* (C.B.Cl.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).

Diagnosis: "Leaves crowded in a tuft at the top of a woody root stock; peduncles slender; flowers usually small."

The section, as originally published, contained one species (*D. longipes* C.B.Cl.) which Clarke had previously placed in section *Didymanthus*, and seven others described by Ridley since Clarke's work. *D. longipes* fully meets the sectional diagnosis, is better known than the later species and seems in every way suitable as lectotype.

Sect. ELATI Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 28 (1905).

Lectotype: D. CORCHORIFOLIUS [Wall ex.] DC. Prodr. ix, 265 (1892).

Syn.: *Roettlera corchorifolia* (DC.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).

Diagnosis: "Stem tall branched shrubby. Leaves in distant pairs opposite unequal."

The four species placed here were included in an extended concept of section *Eudidymocarpus* in the Flora of the Malay Peninsula. Of the four *D. corchorifolius* agrees best with the sectional diagnosis, for it alone of them can be legitimately described as "tall branched shrubby." It is a very distinctive species with an almost closed corolla-mouth, and is certainly not referable to section *Eudidymocarpus*. *D. corchorifolius* is often attributed to R. Brown (in Benn. Pl. Jav. Rar. 119: 1840), but neither that author nor Wallich ever published a description of it.

Sect. PECTINATI Ridley, Fl. Malay, Penins. ii, 508 (1923).

Lectotype: *D. pectinata* [Clarke ex.] Oliv. in Hook. Ic. Pl. xxiii, tab. 2246 (1892).

Diagnosis: "Leaves crowded at the top, narrow lanceolate dentate or pectinate or entire; flowers small tubular."

Three species were included: *D. pectinatus* Oliv., *D. serratifolius* Ridley, and *D. densifolius* Ridley. The last of these Ridley himself knew to be doubtful and it has now been re-classified *Paraboea densifolia* (Ridley) Henderson (in Gard. Bull. Str. Settlements, v, 79: 1930). *D. serratifolius* would have no advantage over *D. pectinatus* as lectotype and the obvious course is to retain the link between sectional and specific names. For earlier treatment of this group see below under section *Salicini*.

Sect. REPTANTES Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 29 (1905), et Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 507 (1923).

Lectotype: D. REPTANS Jack, Malay Misc. i (5), 3 (1820).

Syn.: *Roettlera reptans* (Jack) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 477 (1891).

Diagnosis: "Prostrate or creeping herbs. Leaves in distant pairs equal or unequal hairy or pubescent."

D. reptans is by far the best known species of this section, having been collected many times on Penang Hill. The sectional name first appeared, without any description, in the form "*Didymocarpus* (§ *Reptantes*) *reptans* Jack" (Journ. Linn. Soc. London, Bot. xxii, 511: 1896).

Sect. SALICINI Ridley in Journ. Linn. Soc. London, Bot. xxxii, 514 (1896) et in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br., xliv, 30 (1905).

Lectotype: PARABOEA SALICINA (Ridley) Ridley, Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 530 (1923).

Syn.: *Didymocarpus salicinus* Ridley in Trans. Linn. Soc. London, 2 ser. iii, 329 (1893).

Diagnosis: "Small short-flowered species with narrow willow leaves crowded at the top of a short woody stem."

This section originally included, in addition to *D. salicinus*, *D. dentatus* Ridley (from Lingga Island, and therefore not mentioned in later accounts of

the peninsular species) and *D. pectinatus* Ridley. Ridley obviously regarded *D. salicinus* as the type species, for when he transferred it to the genus *Paraboea* he quite rightly dropped this sectional name and made a new section, *Pectinati* (see p. 204).

Section proposed by Handel-Mazzetti

Sect. PETROCOSMEOPSIS Handel-Mazzetti, Symb. Sin. vii (2), 880 (Feb. 1936).

Holotype: D. SPELUNCAE Handel-Mazzetti, Symb. Sin. vii (2), 1377 (Sept. 1936).

Syn.: *D. minutus* Handel-Mazzetti, Symb. Sin. vii (2), 880 (Feb. 1936) —non Kraenzlin.

HEMIBOEA C.B.Cl. in Hook. Ic. Pl. xviii, sub tab. 1798 (1888).

Lectotype: H. FOLLICULARIS C.B.Cl. in Hook. Ic. Pl. xviii, sub tab. 1798 (1888).

C. B. Clarke established the genus *Hemiboea* for three distinct species, *H. follicularis, H. Henryi* and *H. subcapitata*, all of which were first described by him. *H. follicularis* formed section *Sympodiales*, while the other two formed section *Subcapitatae*.

It is clear from the name of the genus, and from the description Clarke gave of it, that he attached paramount importance to the characters of the fruit. One species only was known in flower and fruit, *H. follicularis:* the others were represented by flowering specimens alone. It is therefore proposed to take *H. follicularis* as lectotype of the genus.

Sect. SYMPODIALES C.B.Cl. in Hook. Ic. Pl. xviii, sub tab. 1798 (1888).

Syn.: *Hemiboea* sect. *Chromoboea* K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 156 (1895)—*nomen illegitimum*.

Holotype: H. FOLLICULARIS C.B.Cl.

Sect. SUBCAPITATAE C.B.Cl. in Hook. Ic. Pl. xviii, sub tab. 1798 (1888).

Syn.: *Hemiboea* sect. *Leucoboea* K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 156 (1895)—*nomen illegitimum*.

Lectotype: H. SUBCAPITATA C.B.Cl. in Hook. Ic. Pl. xviii, sub tab. 1798 (1888).

H. Henryi was the species illustrated by C. B. Clarke, but this fact seems less important in the choice of the type of the section than the link between the specific epithet of the other species and the sectional name.

K. Fritsch's action in replacing Clarke's adjectival sectional names with new ones in substantival form is inadmissible.

ISOMETRUM Craib in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. xi, 250, 267 (1919).

Lectotype: I. FARRERI Craib in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. xi, 250, 267 (1919).

The only other species known when the genus was established was *I. glandulosum* (Batalin) Craib and of this Craib had seen no material. *I. Farreri* has since been illustrated in Curtis's Botanical Magazine (tab. 8917: 1938).

OREOCHARIS Benth. in Benth. & Hook. fil. Gen. Pl. ii, 1021 (1876).

Lectotype: O. BENTHAMI C.B.Cl. Mon. 63 (1883).

Syn.: *Didymocarpus oreocharis* Hance in Ann. Sc. Nat. 5 sér., v, 230 (1866).

Bentham referred to this genus, in addition to *Didymocarpus oreocharis*, *Boea primuloides* Miq. and the plant which Maximowicz (in Bull. Acad. Petrop. xix, 535 : 1874; et Mél. Biol. ix, 368 : 1874) had referred to *Didymocarpus lanuginosus* Wall. These two plants are still retained in *Oreocharis*, the first as *O. primuloides* (Miq.) C.B.Cl., the second as *O. Maximowiczii* C.B.Cl., but there can be no doubt that Bentham's concept of *Oreocharis* was based on *Didymocarpus oreocharis*. In fact he seems to have seen no specimens of the other two species.

Subgen. OREOCHARIS.

Syn.: *Oreocharis* subgen. *Euoreocharis* C.B.Cl. Mon. 63 (1883).

Oreocharis sect. *Euoreocharis* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 145 (1895).

Lectotype: O. BENTHAMI C.B.Cl.

Subgen. STOMACTIN C.B.Cl. Mon. 64 (1883).

Syn.: *Oreocharis* sect. *Stomactin* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 145 (1895).

Holotype: O. AURICULA (S. Moore) C.B.Cl. Mon. 65 (1883).

Syn.: *Didymocarpus Auricula* S. Moore in Trimen, Journ. Bot. 1875, 229.

PARABOEA (C.B.Cl.) Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 4, 62 (1905), et Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 527 (1923); Burtt in Kew Bull. 1948, 55.

Lectotype: P. CLARKEI B. L. Burtt in Kew Bull. 1948, 56.

Syn.: *Didymocarpus paraboea* C.B.Cl. Mon. 106 (1883).

Roettlera paraboea (C.B.Cl.) O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. ii, 476 (1891).

I have already dealt with the typification of this genus (Kew Bull. 1948, 55), but it may be as well to repeat the decisions here and to complete the synonymy.

Sect. PARABOEA (C.B.Cl.) B. L. Burtt in Kew Bull. 1948, 56.

Syn.: *Didymocarpus* sect. *Paraboea* C.B.Cl. Mon. 106 (1883).

Roettlera sect. *Paraboea* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).

Paraboea sect. *Breviflores* Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 64 (1905).

Paraboea sect. *Eu-Paraboea* Ridley, Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 528 (1923)—*nomen illegitimum*.

Lectotype: P. CLARKEI B. L. Burtt.

Sect. CAMPANULATAE Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 63 (1905), et Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 528 (1923).

Syn.: *Didymocarpus* sect. *Salicini* Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 30 (1905)—see p. 204.

Lectotype: P. CAMPANULATA Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 65 (1905).

PERANTHA Craib in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. x, 212 (1918).

Lectotype: P. FORRESTII Craib in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. x, 213 (1918).

This genus was established for three species, *P. minor* Craib, *P. Forrestii* Craib and *P. cordatula* Craib. *P. Forrestii* is the best known of them, and the one described by Craib from living material. *Perantha* is now generally

regarded as not being distinct from *Oreocharis* and *P. Forrestii* is synonymous with *Oreocharis aurantiaca* Franch.

PHYLLOBOEA Benth. in Benth. & Hook. fil. Gen. Pl. ii, 1020 (1876).

Lectotype: BOEA AMPLEXICAULIS Parish MS.—non C.B.Cl.

Bentham mentioned that his genus contained four species. Two "humiles villosae foliis alternis v. valde disparibus" appear to be the plants now known as *Trisepalum obtusum* C.B.Cl. and *Trisepalum acutum* C.B.Cl. The fourth species, of which Bentham quoted C. B. Clarke's unnamed illustration (Comm. et Cyrt. Beng. t. 87 bis: 1874) is now *Tetraphyllum bengalense* C.B.Cl. It is the third species which has been generally accepted as typifying *Phylloboea*. This Bentham cited as "tertia (a Parishio sub nomine *Boeae amplexicaulis* cum ic. optima recepta sed non *B. amplexicaulis*, Clarke)."

However, C. B. Clarke (Mon. 140: 1883) reaffirmed his determination of Parish's plant with the Kurz specimens he had illustrated and described (Comm. et Cyrt. Beng. tab. 84: 1874) as *Boea amplexicaulis*, and the species thus became *Phylloboea amplexicaulis* (C.B.Cl.) C.B.Cl. The type specimen is Kurz 2998 in the Calcutta herbarium, for though Parish originated the specific epithet in manuscript his own plant was never described. Therefore it is clear that this species cannot be regarded as the lectotype of Bentham's genus, for, rightly or wrongly, he expressly says it is not his plant. In fact he quotes Clarke's illustration under the genus *Boea*. Bentham is supported in his views by Stapf (in Kew Bull. 1913, p. 355), at least to the extent that Stapf refuses to accept Clarke's illustration as proof that the capsules of *Phylloboea* really are twisted, which is the main discrepancy between Parish's plant and Kurz's, as illustrated by Clarke. The problem remains to be settled, but the present position is that *Boea amplexicaulis* Parish MS. must be taken as the lectotype of *Phylloboea* If, as Bentham and Stapf believed, it is distinct from *Phylloboea amplexicaulis* (C.B.Cl.) C.B.Cl., then it lacks a validly published specific name.

ROETTLERA Vahl, Enum. i, 88 (1805); ampl. K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 146 (1895). For typification see *Didymocarpus* sect. *Orthoboae* (p. 200).

K. Fritsch used Vahl's generic name *Roettlera* to include *Didymocarpus* (in its broad sense), *Chirita* and *Trachystigma*. There is little to recommend such a collective genus and it is not adopted in this paper. The following list will serve as a résumé of Fritsch's classification and as an index to correlate it with the rest of this paper.

Subgen. Didymocarpus—see *Didymocarpus*.
- Sect. Eudidymocarpus—see *Didymocarpus* sect. *Eudidymocarpus*
- Sect. Monophylloides—see *Didymocarpus* sect. *Monophylloides*
- Sect. Didymanthus—see *Didymocarpus* sect. *Didymanthus*
- Sect. Kompsoboea—see *Didymocarpus* sect. *Kompsoboea*
- Sect. Heteroboea—see *Didymocarpus* sect. *Heteroboea*
- Sect. Loxocarpus—see *Didymocarpus* sect. *Loxocarpus*
- Sect. Orthoboea—see *Didymocarpus* sect. *Orthoboea*
- Sect. Paraboea—see *Paraboea*
- Sect. Hova—see *Didymocarpus* sect. *Hova*

Subgen. Chirita—see *Chirita*
- Sect. Euchirita—see *Chirita* sect. *Euchirita*

Sect. Liebigia—see *Chirita* sect. *Liebigia*
Sect. Bilabium—see *Chirita* sect. *Bilabium*
Sect. Microchirita—see *Chirita* sect. *Microchirita*
Sect. Gibbosaccus—see *Chirita* sect. *Gibbosaccus*
Sect. Trachystigma—see *Trachystigma*

STREPTOCARPUS Lindley in Bot. Reg. tab. 1173 (1828).
Holotype: S. REXII (Hook.) Lindley in Bot. Reg. tab. 1173 (1828).
Syn.: *Didymocarpus Rexii* Hook. Exot. Fl. tab. 227 (1827).
Subgen. STREPTOCARPUS.
Syn.: *Streptocarpus* subgen. *Eustreptocarpus* K. Fritsch, Die Keimpflanzen der Gesneriaceen, 158 (1904).
Holotype: S. REXII (Hook.) Lindley.
Sect. ROSULATI K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 151 (1895).
Lectotype: S. REXII (Hook.) Lindley.
S. Rexii is botanically typical of the group, it is the best known species, and it is nomenclaturally convenient to have the type species of the genus also the type of one of its sections.
Sect. UNIFOLIATI K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 151 (1893).
Lectotype: S. POLYANTHUS Hook. in Curtis's Bot. Mag. tab. 4850 (1855).
Fritsch mentions *S. polyanthus* as the best known species of the section, it has the advantage of having been well illustrated, and it is typical of an alliance to which several other species belong. This group is characterised by having a corolla with a curved tube, which is laterally compressed at its mouth, and an oblique limb. The other species to be closely associated with *S. polyanthus* are *S. Haygarthii* N.E. Br., *S. prolixus* N.E. Br., *S. gracilis* B. L. Burtt, *S. Comptonii* Mansfeld and *S. Reynoldsii* Verdoorn.
Subgen. STREPTOCARPELLA K. Fritsch, Die Keimpflanzen der Gesneriaceen, 158 (1904).
Syn.: *Streptocarpus* sect. *Caulescentes* K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 151 (1895).
Lectotype: S. CAULESCENS Vatke in Linnaea, xliii, 323 (1882).
S. caulescens is a typical representative of this group, and is well known from wild material, as well as having been in cultivation for many years. I have dealt with the synonymy of the species elsewhere (B. L. Burtt in Kew Bull. 1939, 81).

TRACHYSTIGMA C.B.Cl. Mon. 131 (1883).
Syn.: *Roettlera* sect. *Trachystigma* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).
Holotype: T. MANNII C.B.Cl. Mon. 131 et tab. xiv (1883).
Syn.: *Roettlera Mannii* (C.B.Cl.) K. Fritsch in Pflanzenfam. 148 (1895).