

NOTES ON CULTIVATED ACANTHACEAE: I

B. L. BURTT & P. J. B. WOODS

PSEUDERANTHEMUM ROSEUM

For many years a tropical acanthaceous plant has been grown at the Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh as *Aphelandra velutina*. A recent check revealed that this name must be of garden origin and it could only be found in the Kew Handlist of Tender Dicotyledons. However, examination showed that the plant could not be a species of *Aphelandra* as it had only two stamens. It was eventually identified with Linden & Fournier's illustration of *Eranthemum roseum* (1876), a name which should never have been used as it repeated the earlier *Eranthemum roseum* (Vahl) R.Br. (1810). In 1884 Radlkofer established the genus *Pseuderanthemum* for numerous species previously assigned to *Eranthemum*, and *E. roseum* Lind. & Fourn. was one of the species he transferred. As there was no obstacle to the use of the epithet *roseum* in the new genus the name *Pseuderanthemum roseum* may be attributed to Radlkofer as a new name (Int. Code Bot. Nomencl. Art. 72:1956) and this appears to be the correct name for the species.

However there have been further complications. The Chelsea nurseryman William Bull introduced the name *Eranthemum velutinum* in his catalogue for 1886 and plants seem to have persisted in cultivation under this name, for the flowering of one at Paris was recorded in 1920. It may also have given rise to *Aphelandra velutina* by error. Guillaumin transferred this plant to *Pseuderanthemum* in 1926 and maintained the epithet *velutinum* although he was aware of the earlier *P. velutinum* Lindau. He actually re-named the latter because it was based on *Eranthemum velutinum* Boerlage (1891) which was later than *E. velutinum* Bull (1886). Boerlage's name is, of course, illegitimate, but, as in the case of *P. roseum* Radlk., *P. velutinum* Lindau stands as a legitimate new name. Curiously, Index Kewensis gives Guillaumin's new name, *P. pseudo-velutinum*, as a replacement for *P. velutinum* Guillaumin, whereas it was clearly, though wrongly, proposed to replace *P. velutinum* Lindau*.

Both *P. roseum* and "*P. velutinum* of gardens" are included by Chittenden in the R.H.S. Dictionary of Gardening, but there appear to be no characters by which they can be distinguished. Should these eventually be found, then *P. velutinum* would need to be re-named. It seems more likely however that only one species is involved and this will bear the name *P. roseum* Radlk.

Linden & Fournier said that this plant came from the high valleys of the Amazon. Guillaumin, after the plant had been in cultivation for many

* *Pseuderanthemum velutinum* Lindau in Engl. Bot. Jahrb. xix, Beibl. No. 48, 5 (1895) Syn.: *Eranthemum velutinum* Boerlage, Hand. Fl. Ned. Ind. ii, 661 (1891)—non Bull (1886).

Pseuderanthemum pseudo-velutinum Guillaumin in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, xxxii, 410 (1926).

years, gave Malaysia as its country of origin, but the basis for this statement is unknown to us and there seems no reason to doubt that it is a native of Tropical America. At Edinburgh this plant reproduces itself readily by seed, and self-sown seedlings are not uncommon in the Aroid House and on the staging in the Stove. It is normally propagated, however, from cuttings. The large handsome leaves, deep velvety green above and purple below are as decorative as the mauve pink flowers, the inflorescences of which are rather thin and spindly considering the size of the leaves.

Pseuderanthemum roseum Radlk. in Sitzb. Math.-phys. Cl. Akad. Wiss. Muench. 1883, xiii, 286 (1884); Chittenden in R.H.S. Dict. Gard. iii, 1702 (1951).

Syn.: *Eranthemum roseum* Linden & Fournier in Illustr. Hortic. xxiii, 42, tab. 235 (1876); Kew Bull. Add. Ser. iv, 175 (1900)—non R.Br. (1810).

Eranthemum velutinum Bull, Cat. 8 (1886); Nicholson, Dict. Gard. Suppl. i, 543 (1900); Kew Bull. Add. Ser. iv, 175 (1900); M.D. Bois in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, xxvi, 572 (1920).

Pseuderanthemum velutinum (Bull) Guillaumin in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, xxxii, 409 (1926)—non Lindau (1895).

Aphelandra velutina hort.—Kew Handlist Tender Dicots. 45 (1900); ed. 2, 14 (1931), *nomen tantum*.

RUELLIA ROSEA

Ruellia rosea appears to be the correct name for an attractive pink flowered acanthad that has long been grown at Edinburgh as an undetermined species of *Ruellia*. In recent years it has also been received from continental botanic gardens as *R. amoena* and *R. rubricaulis*, but it has no claim to either of these names, which represent quite different species.

Ruellia rosea belongs to a group of species characterized by an arcuate corolla-tube and expanded lobes spreading at right angles to the tube, and by the flowers themselves being borne on flattened winged peduncles. The general structure may be seen from the illustration of a member of the group published as *R. acutangula* Nees (Bot. Mag. t. 6382: 1878).

Confusion regarding use of the name *R. rosea* seems to have arisen from the fact that soon after Bull's introduction of this plant into cultivation it was referred to as "*R. rosea* Bull.—non Mart.?", the implication being that Bull's plant was being misidentified. It was not realized that the nomenclatural facts render this question irrelevant, so far as the name of the cultivated plant is concerned. Nees ab Esenbeck split up the genus *Ruellia* when he wrote the account of Acanthaceae for Martius, Flora Brasiliensis, and *R. rosea* was placed in the genus *Arrhoxystylon*. Till that time *R. rosea* was only a manuscript name and Nees validated it only as a species of *Arrhoxystylon*. Nearly thirty years later, when Bull used *Ruellia rosea* for the plant he had introduced into cultivation, the name had still not been validly published in *Ruellia*. Now Bull made no reference whatsoever to Martius or Nees; he simply used *Ruellia rosea* and gave a description of the plant. This constitutes the first valid publication of

Ruellia rosea and as such it stands, whether or not *Arrhoxystylon roseum* is the same.* If they prove to be different then it is the latter which will need a new name on transference to *Ruellia*. Similarly Hemsley's *R. rosea*, based on *Ophthalmacanthus roseus* Nees, will have to be renamed if it is to be maintained as a species of *Ruellia*.

Ruellia rosea Bull, Retail list of new beautiful and rare plants [= "Catalogue"], 1878, 8, and 1879, 44; Kew Bull. Add. Ser. iv, 352 (1900); Chittenden in R.H.S. Dict. Gard. iv, 1839 (1951)—nec *R. rosea* Wall. List No. 7154 (1832) nomen et ex Nees in DC. Prodr. xi, 177 (1847), in syn.; nec *R. rosea* (Nees) Hemsl. Biol. Centr. Amer. Bot. ii, 507 (1881-2).

Syn.: ?*R. rosea* Mart. (Obs. MSS. No. 1089) ex Nees in Mart. Fl. Bras. ix, 61 (1847), in syn., et in DC. Prodr. xi, 215 (1847), in syn. ?*Arrhoxystylon roseum* Nees in Mart. Fl. Bras. ix, 61 (1847).

As some of these nurserymen's catalogues are relatively inaccessible, it may be useful to quote Bull's description in full. There is a specimen, preserved at the time, in the Kew herbarium and this may be taken as the type of the species.

"A pretty Acanthad of free-growing habit, introduced from Brazil. It has bluntly quadrangular stems with opposite, oblong-elliptic leaves. The inflorescence is axillary on winged petioles (sic), bearing a small cyme of 4-6 flowers the calyx of which is cut into 5 linear divisions of unequal length. The corolla is of a beautiful bright rosy pink or mauve, with a curved tube $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch long and a spreading limb about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch across, consisting of 5 roundish emarginate lobes, each half an inch across. It is a free-growing, free-blooming plant and can scarcely fail to be a favourite; for although the flowers are fugacious they are of a most attractive and pleasing colour. 10s. 6d."

* From description Nees' plant seems to be more shrubby in habit and to have smaller blunter leaves. Otherwise the description would fit well with the cultivated plant.

Camellia Paintings (review)*.—"This book is intended to be the first of a series of volumes on the Camellia and the purpose of the work is to make available to those of moderate means a series of flower books of artistic merit and literary interest." That quotation from the Foreword should also be read as a rider to the title, *The Camellia*, which might otherwise seem somewhat presumptuous, for this particular volume only deals with *C. sinensis*, *C. x williamsii* 'J. C. Williams' and 18 forms of *C. japonica*. The editor goes on to affirm her personal faith in the superiority of artist over colour-photograph, and her courage in setting artists to work on original illustrations is highly creditable. We have seen in recent years too many flower books reproducing once again the paintings of Redouté,

* The *Camellia*, edited by Beryl Leslie Urquhart. Leslie Urquhart Press, Sharpthorne, Sussex, 1956. Folio, 20 pp., 20 coloured illustrations each with one leaf of text. Price £3, 15s.