STUDIES IN THE GESNERIACEAE OF THE OLD WORLD

XX: MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

B. L. Burtt

Contents

1. Confusion between Staurogyne (Acanthaceae) and Gesneriaceae

In a previous paper in this series (Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xxii, 311, 313: 1958) I had occasion to refer an allegedly gesneriad genus from Africa, *Saintpauliopsis* Staner, and the Chinese *Loxostigma sesamoides* Hand.-Mazz. to *Staurogyne*. It then seemed strange to find two members of this genus described in Gesneriaceae, but I have since come to learn that the confusion, both ways, has occurred on several other occasions. Thus in making a further correction it seems not without interest, a cautionary interest, to mention these instances together, in one place. Those known to me are:

(a) *Staurogyne macrantha* C.B. Clarke in Journ. As. Soc. Bengal, lxxiv, 642 (1908); Ridley, Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 563 (1923); cf. Bremekamp in Reinwardtia, iii, 244 (1955).

(b) *Staurogyne serrulata* C. B. Clarke in Journ. As. Soc. Bengal, lxxiv, 642 (1908); Ridley, Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 563 (1923); cf. Bremekamp in Reinwardtia, iii, 245 (1955).

The types of both these species are in the Calcutta herbarium and were shown to me there in August 1958 by Dr. D. Chatterjee, who had examined them at the suggestion of Dr. C. E. B. Bremekamp. There is no doubt that both these specimens belong to *Didymocarpus* and one cannot help being surprised that C. B. Clarke, who knew both genera so well, should fall into this error. Dr. Chatterjee will be publishing a note on the plants shortly.

(c) *Loxostigma sesamoides* Hand.-Mazz.=*Staurogyne sesamoides* (Hand.-Mazz.) B. L. Burtt in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xxii, 311 (1958).

(d) *Saintpauliopsis lebrunii* Staner=*Staurogyne lebrunii* (Staner) B. L. Burtt in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xxii, 313 (1958).

(e) *Didissandra clarkei* Koorders in Meded.'s Lands Plantent. xix, 551 (1898) et Suppl. Fl. N.O. Celebes, ii & iii, t.122 (1922)=*Staurogyne debilis* (T. And.) C.B.Cl. ex Merr.; cf. Bremekamp in Reinwardtia, iii, 230 (1955).

(f) *Didissandra parviflora* Ridley in van Steenis & Rüttner, Pterid. & Phan. Deutsch. Limnol. Sunda-Exped. (Arch. Hydrobiol. suppl. xi), 328 (1932)=*Staurogyne bullata* Bremekamp in Reinwardtia, iii, 230 (1955).

(g) *Didissandra novoguineensis* Kanehira & Hatusima in Bot. Mag. Tokyo, lvii, 113 (1943)=*Staurogyne dasystachya* Bremek. in Reinwardtia, iii, 209 (1955)=**Staurogyne novoguineensis** (Kanehira & Hatusima) B. L. Burtt, **comb. nov.**

Bremekamp evidently received an undetermined specimen of this plant and correctly referred it to *Staurogyne* without being aware that Kanehira & Hatusima had previously fallen into the trap of describing it as a *Didissandra*. Unfortunately the earlier epithet must now be adopted.

Technical characters apart, the racemose bracteate inflorescence and the finely pointed, strongly nerved calyx-segments found in *Staurogyne* are quite unlike anything found amongst the Old World members of the *Gesneriaceae*.

2. The Taxonomic Position of Siphobaea

In 1888 Baillon added to *Gesneriaceae* a new genus, *Siphobaea*, from material that had been collected many years previously in the Philippine Islands by Commerson, after whom he named the single species *S. commersonii*. There were several lacunae in Baillon's description, due to the incompleteness of the material, and I am not aware that any later author has dealt with the identity of these specimens, although the genus has been accepted as a gesneriad (e.g. by K. Fritsch in Engl. & Prantl, Pflanzenfam. iv, 3B, 159: 1894).

The opportunity of examining the original material arose during a recent visit to Paris and I am most grateful to the authorities of the Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle for the facilities afforded to me.

On seeing Commerson's specimens it was at once clear that *Siphobaea* had been misplaced in *Gesneriaceae*: inflorescence, corolla and androecium are all quite unlike anything found in that family. I did not immediately determine the correct position of *Siphobaea* but reflexion convinced me that it must be very close to *Clerodendrum*. I therefore searched through the material of that genus in the Edinburgh herbarium and soon found the species *C. minahassae* Teysm. & Binn., which seemed to me an exact match of the material of *Siphobaea* I had recently examined. Accordingly I wrote to Dr. Alicia Lourteig in Paris and asked her to confirm my identification by examining the specimens of *Siphobaea* and the *Clerodendrum* side by side. This Dr. Lourteig has very kindly done and she has written to say that she fully agrees that they are conspecific.

The genus *Siphobaea* therefore disappears from *Gesneriaceae* and lapses into synonymy, thus:

Clerodendrum minahassae Teysm. & Binn. in Nat. Tijdschr. Nederl. Ind. xxv, 409 (1863); Miq., Ann. Mus. Bot. Lugd.-Bat. iii, 251, t.9 (1867); Merrill, Enum. Phil. Fl. Pl. iii, 403 (1923).

Syn. nov.: *Siphobaea commersonii* Baill. in Bull. Soc. Linn. Paris, i, 733 (1888) et Hist. Pl. x, 106 (1888); K. Fritsch in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. iv, 3B, 159 (1894); Lemée, Dict. descr. syn. gen. pl. phan. vi, 130 (1935).

3. Notes on Chirita

Chirita chanetii Léveillé in Bull. Acad. Geogr. Bot. xvii, n. 210–211, p. iii (1907)=*Rehmannia chanetii* (Léveillé) Léveillé in Fedde, Rep. Sp. Nov. ix, 323 (1911)=**Rehmannia glutinosa** (Gaertn.) Fisch. & Mey. sens. lat.

China. Pe-Tche-Ly: Tchao-Tchao, 7 Mai 1905, *Chanet* 19 (E, F, G).

For some reason that I do not understand, H. L. Li, when revising the genus *Rehmannia* (in Taiwania, i, 81: 1948), has referred this species back to *Chirita*. Examination of the original specimens, however, leaves no doubt that they belong to the rather variable species *Rehmannia glutinosa*.

Chirita chlamydata W. W. Smith—see *Didissandra begoniifolia* Léveillé (p. 100).

Chirita cristata (Dalzell) B. L. Burtt, **comb. nov.**

Syn.: *Didymocarpus cristatus* Dalzell in Hook. Journ. Bot. & Kew Gard. Misc. iii, 225 (1851); Dalzell & Gibson, Bombay Fl. 134 (1861).

Through the kindness of Prof. A. R. Chavan of the University of Baroda, we have been able to cultivate this plant, on which he has published some organogenetic data (Chavan & Desmukh in Journ. M.S. Univ. Baroda, i (2), 73–77: 1952 & v (2), 29–36: 1956). Prof. Chavan's material comes from the walls of the fort at Pavagadh, north-east of Baroda, and this is the locality from which Dalzell described the species. C. B. Clarke (in DC. Mon. Phan. v (1), 128: 1883) reduced it to *Chirita hamosa* R. Br., but the corolla of that species is larger, funnel-shaped rather than tubular in the upper part, and it also has larger fruits.

More recently Santapau & Saldanha (in Journ. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. liii (2), 212: 1955) have recorded this plant as *Didymocarpus pygmaeus* C.B.Cl., a species usually found further east (Bihar & Orissa etc.), and I am indebted to Father Santapau for the loan of material from the Blatter herbarium. Living material of *Chirita cristata* clearly has the bifid stigma of *Chirita*, as Prof. Chavan has described. Even should *Didymocarpus pygmaeus* prove to be the same plant, *C. cristata* would stand as the earlier name.

Chirita cycnostyla B. L. Burtt, **species nova** in sectione *Gibbosacco* C. B. Clarke ponenda, ubi statura parva, foliorum laminis rotundatis a petiolis distinctis, corollis parvis (haud basi gibbosis sed medio tubo leviter ventricosis) facile distinguitur.

Herba perennis, nana; caudex basibus foliorum delapsorum ornatus, apice subrosulato-foliatus. *Folia* petiolis breviter piloso-pubescentibus 1 cm. longis suffulta; lamina ut videtur subcarnosa, plus minusve elliptica,

1·25–1·75 cm. longa, 0·75–1 cm. lata, apice obtusa, basi abrupte cuneata, marginibus in sicco recurvis obscure undulato-crenatis, utrinque breviter pubescens, costa subtus tantum prominula. *Inflorescentiae* 1·3 cm. ex axillis foliorum superiorum longe pedunculatae. *Pedunculus* 12 cm. usque longus, breviter et parce pubescens. *Bracteae* ovato-lanceolatae vel oblongae, c. 3 mm. longae et 1·5 mm. latae. *Pedicelli* c. 2 mm. longi, uti bracteae pedunculique pubescentes. *Calyx* ad basin in segmentis 5 tenuibus parce pubescentibus anguste oblongis 5 mm. longis et 1 mm. latis divisus. *Corolla* 1 cm. longa; tubus 7 mm. longus, medio leviter ventricosus limbus leviter bilabiatus lobis subaequalibus oblongis obtusis 3 mm. longis et 2 mm. latis. *Stamina* fertilia 2, filamentis glabris 1·5 mm. longis, 2 mm. supra corollae basi inserta; antherae 2 mm. latae, thecis divergentibus, coram adhaerentes, breviter crispo-pilosae (praecipue ad marginem inferiorem); staminodia duo, 1 mm. longa. *Ovarium* 2·5 mm. longum, breviter patule pubescens; placentae parietales bilamellatae, lamella altera sterili altera ovuligera; stylus 5 mm. longus, curvatus, breviter pubescens; stigma unilamellatum, linguiforme, 1 mm. paullo excedens, stylo aequilatum. *Fructus* ignotus.

INDO-CHINA: Annam. Ba-Na, près Tourane; petite plante sur roche; tige florale et sepale grenat, après eclosion les sepales sont blanches à la face interne et rosé a la partie externe, petale blanche jolie mais inodore, feuilles épaisses vert bronze clair en dessus et vert résédal ou vert d'eau pâle en dessous; sol granitique 1000 à 1500 m. alt. couvert de vieille forêt; 27 Feb. 1939, *E. Poilane* 29123 (holo. P.).

The first flower of this species which I dissected had a gynoecium so extraordinarily swan-like in the curvature of the style (enhanced by the "body" of the ovary and the "beak" of the stigma) as to dictate the specific epithet.

The name of the section, *Gibbosaccus*, has proved somewhat unfortunate, for though it provided a good description of the only original species, *C. sinensis* Lindl., the other species described since have not had corollas gibbous at the base. *C. cycnostyla* was not at first taken for a member of this section, or indeed of the genus at all. However the similarity of androecium and gynoecium are very striking, the latter having half of each placenta sterile and a ligular stigma just as in *C. sinensis* itself (see Bot. Mag. t.4284: 1847).

The specimen was selected for study during a brief visit to the Paris herbarium in February 1959, and I am grateful to the authorities there for sending this and other material on loan to Edinburgh.

Chirita dielsii (Borza) B. L. Burtt, **comb. nov.**

Syn.: *Roettlera uniflora* Franch. in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, 1899, 251—non *Chirita uniflora* Ridl. (1912).

Didymocarpus dielsii Borza in Fedde, Rep. Sp. Nov. xiii, 390 (1914); Handel-Mazzetti, Symb. Sin. vii (2), 882 (1936).

Chirita orbicularis W. W. Sm. in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. ix, 94 (1916).

CHINA: Yunnan. Pic de Tian Chien, fleur bleu, juillet 1890, *Delavay* (holo. *R. uniflora*—P). Yung-pe mountains, lat. 26°45′N., Aug. 1913, *Forrest* 10923 (holo. *C. orbicularis*—E). Mts. between Yung-peh and Yungning, lat. 27°20′N., long. 100°48′E., Aug. 1922, *Forrest* 22065 (E).

Mts. N. of Yungpeh, lat. 26°45′N., long. 100°45′E., Sept. 1922, *Forrest* 22326 (E). Shunning, Litah, [24°35′N., 99°55′E.], Sept. 1938, *T.T. Yu* 17605 (E). Shunning, Wenkuankaui, 16 June 1938, *T.T. Yu* 16288 (E).

Handel-Mazzetti saw the types of *Didymocarpus dielsii* and *Chirita orbicularis* and decided they were conspecific. I have seen *Roettlera uniflora* and *Chirita orbicularis*. The triple congruence should, therefore, be reliable. Franchet's epithet, *uniflora*, is the oldest, but is not available in *Chirita*.

Chirita drakei B. L. Burtt, **nom. nov.**

Syn.: *C. bracteosa* Drake in Bull. Soc. Philom. ser. 8, ii, 39 (1890); Pellegrin in Lecomte, Fl. Gén. Indo-Chine, iv, 534 (1930)—non *C. bracteosa* (Zoll.) Miq., Fl. Ind. Bat. ii, 728 (1858).

Chirita lavandulacea Stapf in Bot. Mag. t.9047 (1925).

INDO-CHINA. Prov. Thua-thien, Col des nuages, 400 m., au bord des cascades, 0·45–0·50 m., bleu pâle, *Eberhardt* 2600, rec. 13 April 1916 (P).

Stapf described this species from cultivated material without actual knowledge of where it grew. The specimen quoted above is, to my knowledge, the first record establishing its wild habitat. In Pellegrin's account (Fl. Gén. Indo-Chine, iv, 526: 1930) it may be inserted near *C. hamosa*, and *C. marcanii*. From the former it differs in its bearded anthers, from the latter in its flower colour (lavender not orange): from both it is further distinguished by a broader corolla tube and by the inflorescence being scarcely adnate to the petiole. *C. lavandulacea* is very efficiently self-pollinated, a state of affairs apparently connected with the fact that the anthers do not long cohere together. Seed is set freely and consequently the species has persisted in cultivation. It is still often wrongly identified as *C. horsfieldii*, an almost shrubby species from Sumatra.

Chirita pellegriniana B. L. Burtt, **nom. nov.**

Syn.: *Didymocarpus balansae* Pellegrin in Bull. Soc. Bot. Fr. lxxiii, 415 (1926) et in Lecomte, Fl. Gén. Indo-Chine, iv, 520, fig. 57, 5–9 (1930)—non *Chirita balansae* Drake (1890).

TONKIN. Mt. Bavi, *Balansa* 4287, 4294 (P). Taai Wong Mo Shan Vicinity, Tong fa market, Ha-coi, Sept. 1939, *W. T. Tsang* 29473 (A). Sai Wong Mo Shan, Long Ngong village, Dam-ha, 18 July–9 Sept., 1940, *W. T. Tsang* 30186 (A). Entre Cao Bang et Nguyên Binh, juin 1939, *Pételot* 7·256 (E). Province de Sontây, Mt. Bavi, rochers siliceux dans un ravin, avril 1940, *Pételot* 7·233 (E).

In the first article of this series (Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xxi, 185–187) I discussed the value of stigmatic form and its description. The plant now transferred from *Didymocarpus* to *Chirita* has a stigma quite similar to that of *Chirita lacei*: it is the ventral lamella only that is well developed and this is entire, not itself bilobed as in *Chirita urticifolia*. It is however a *Chirita* stigma (similar to that of *C. sinensis*) and differs sharply from the capitate structure of *Didymocarpus*.

The epithet *balansae* being already occupied in *Chirita*, this is an opportunity to honour the very careful and valuable work of Prof. F. Pellegrin, who prepared the account of *Gesneriaceae* for Flore Générale de l'Indo-Chine.

Chirita pinnatifida (Hand.-Mazz.) B. L. Burtt, **comb. nov.**

Syn.: *Didymocarpus pinnatifidus* Handel-Mazzetti in Sinensia, v, 8 (1934).

CHINA. Kwangsi: Tsin-lung-shan, Linyen septentr., 1500 m., 18 Aug. 1928, *Ching* 6988 (holo—not seen).

The following material in the Arnold Arboretum herbarium is, from the description, referable to, or closely allied to, this species:—Kwangsi:Yao Shan, *C. Wang* 40038, 40530; Chuen Yuen, *T. S. Chung* 83334; 83461; Ling-Wun, *S. K. Lau* 28625; Tong Shan (along Kwantung border), *W. T. Tsang* 22710.

Chirita subacaulis (Hand.-Mazz.) B. L. Burtt, **comb. nov.**

Syn.: *Hemiboea subacaulis* Handel-Mazzetti, Symb. Sin. vii (2), 887 (1936).

CHINA. Hunan: prope urbem Tschangscha ad rupes umbratas in saltu montis Yolu-schan, 80 m., 20 Oct, 1918, *Handel-Mazzetti* 12758 (iso.E).

The affinity of this species is with *C. tibetica* (Franch.) B. L. Burtt. The fact that it has a sterile ovary loculus does not make it into a *Hemiboea* any more than it does *C. tibetica* or *C. sinensis* Lindl., though whether this character, reinforced by others, will ultimately aid in the splitting up of *Chirita* remains to be seen.

Apart from its larger dark green leaves, which in several species are provided with cystoliths, *Hemiboea* can also be distinguished by its narrowly oblong anthers, with parallel cells and lines of dehiscence not confluent at the tip, and its entire stigma

C. subacaulis and *C. tibetica* are both slender rather dwarf herbs producing long delicate stolons: specimens of *C. tibetica* show that there is a small round tuber some 3–4 inches deep in the soil, rather in the manner of the earthnut, *Conopodium*. The most striking differences between them are in bract and calyces: in *C. subacaulis* the bract is large and subspathaceous, and the calyx segments are narrowly oblong, though blunt and glabrous: in *C. tibetica* the bracts are smaller and the linear-lanceolate calyx-segments are acute and densely pilose.

Chirita tibetica (Franchet) B. L. Burtt, **comb. nov.**

Syn.: *Roettlera tibetica* Franchet in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, 1899, 251.

Didymocarpus tibeticus (Franch.) Hand.-Mazz., Symb. Sin. vii, 881 (1936).

4. NOTES ON DIDYMOCARPUS

Didymocarpus ridleyanus B. L. Burtt, **nom. nov.**

Syn.: *Didymocarpus grandiflorus* Ridl. in Journ. Fed. Mal. St. Mus. vi, 167 (1915), et Fl. Malay Penins. ii. 523 (1923)—non *D. grandiflorus* (Wall.) Dietr. ex Steud. Nom. ed. 2, i, 506 (1841).

Didymocarpus doryphyllus B. L. Burtt, **nom. nov.**

Syn.: *Didymocarpus lanceolatus* Ridl. in Journ. Fed. Mal. St. Mus. iv, 50 (1909), et Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 520 (1923)—non *D. lanceolatus* C.B.Cl. in DC. Mon. Phan. v. 89 (1883).

5. Notes on Didissandra

Didissandra morgani Franch. in Bull. Soc. Linn. Paris, n.s. i, 124 (1899).

Syn.: *D. filicina* Ridley in Journ. As. Soc. Str. Br. xliv, 27 (1905), et Fl. Malay Penins. ii, 505 (1923).

Malay Peninsula. Mountains of Malacca, 1884, *M. de Morgan* (holo. P).

This species has been ignored by later workers, probably because they assumed that it was a Chinese species, like the many others described by Franchet. As might be expected, examination of the type specimen shows that it is one of the species later described by Ridley. *D. morgani* Franch. must replace *D. filicina* Ridl.

Didissandra novoguineensis Kanehira & Hatusima—see above, p. 95.

Didissandra begoniifolia Léveillé in Fedde, Rep. Sp. Nov. xi, 495 (1913).

Syn.: *Chirita chlamydata* W. W. Smith in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. x, 170 (1918).

Loxostigma begoniifolium (Léveillé) Anthony in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xviii, 199 (1934).

China. Kweichow: route de Po-Mey-Tse-Hen, *Esquirol* 972 (holo. E). Yunnan: Mengtze, S.E. Mountains, *Henry* 9188 (K); S. of Red River from Manmei, *Henry* 9188A (holo. *C. chlamydata*—E, K); Feng Cheng Len, *Henry* 9188B (E, K); Mengtze, *Henry* 9413 (K), 9413A (E, K), 9413B (E, K); Mengtze, above Red River, *Hancock* 404 (K); Si-chour-hsien, Foa-doou, *K. M. Feng* 11753 (A); Mar-li-po, Sze-tai-po, *K. M. Feng* 13851 (A).

It is rather seldom that one reverts to one of Léveillé's original names, but I consider that *Didissandra* is the best resting place for this species for the time being. The seeds quite definitely lack the tails necessary for its inclusion in *Loxostigma* and there is no other indication that it belongs there.

In *Chirita* the species is anomalous because four stamens are fertile, though the anthers of the upper pair are smaller than those of the lower.

There are other tetrandrous plants on the borders of *Didissandra* and until all can be examined more critically I prefer to leave them in that genus and to avoid nomenclatural innovations meantime. It seems likely that *Loxostigma aureum* Dunn (in Journ. of Bot. xlv, 403: 1907) belongs to the same group.

6. Species described under the generic name Roettlera

Most of the specific names that have been proposed under *Roettlera* Vahl are simply homonyms for the corresponding species of *Didymocarpus* or *Chirita*, although the union of these two genera did necessitate the coining of a few new epithets (see O. Kuntze, Rev. Gen. 476: 1891).

However during the short time that *Roettlera* was in use as a generic name in *Gesneriaceae* (cf. Burtt in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xxi, 207: 1954) a few species were described by Franchet and others. As the correct assignment of these is not well known it may be useful to enumerate them together.

(a) *R. aurea* Franch. in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, v, 250 (1899)= *Ancylostemon aureus* (Franch.) B. L. Burtt in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xxii, 305 (1958).

(b) *R. fargesii* Franch. in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, v, 251 (1899) =*Opithandra fargesii* (Franch.) B. L. Burtt in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xxii, 303 (1958).

(c) *R. forrestii* Diels in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. v, 224 (1912)=*Oreocharis forrestii* (Diels) Skan in Bot. Mag. t.8719 (1917).

(d) *R. mekongensis* Franch. in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, v, 252 (1899) =*Loxostigma mekongense* (Franch.) B. L. Burtt in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xxii, 310 (1958).

(e) *R. morreniana* Voss in Vilmorin's Blumeng. ed. 3, Sieb. & Voss, i, 795 (1895) in obs.=*Chirita zeylanica* Hook.

This was said to be *Chirita communis* Morren (in Belg. Hort. iii, 238, t.36: 1853), but not *C. communis* Gardner. However, Morren's illustration (which is labelled *C. vulgaris* in error) seems to be quite the same as that of *C. zeylanica* Hook. (in Bot. Mag. t.4182: 1845), of which *C. communis* Gardn. is a synonym.

(f) *R. tibetica* Franch. in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, v, 251 (1899)= *Chirita tibetica* (Franch.) B. L. Burtt (supra p. 99).

(g) *R. uniflora* Franch. in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, v, 251 (1899) =*Chirita dielsii* (Borza) B. L. Burtt (supra p. 97).

(h) *R. yunnanensis* Franch. in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, v, 250 (1899) =*Didymocarpus yunnanensis* (Franch.) W. W. Sm. in Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xiv, 337 (1924).

Although only written in the form " *Didymocarpus* (*Roettlera*) *yunnanensis* Franch." I am inclined to accept this as the publication of the combination. Otherwise it is to be attributed to C. E. C. Fischer (in Kew Bull. 1940, p. 40).

7. A NEW NORTHERN OUTLIER OF STREPTOCARPUS

Streptocarpus phaeotrichus B. L. Burtt, **species nova** nulli arcte affinis. Habitu fortasse *S. bullato* Mansf. similis, sed corolla tubulosa oblique bilabiata limbo patente fauce superne longe pilosa et folio breviore recedit.

Herba. Caulis brevis, ad 3 cm. longus, dense et breviter brunneo-pilosus, apice unifoliatus. *Folium* elliptico-oblongum vel late oblongum, 9 cm. usque longum, 6 cm. usque latum, apice in speciminibus visis imperfecto subobtuso (?), basi leviter cordato, marginibus obscure crenato-dentatis; pagina superior et breviter et parce (basin versus densius) et appresse pubescens, inferior inter nervos laterales utrinque ad 8 leviter arcuatos brevissime pubescens ad costam et nervos pilis rigidis patentibus conspicue brunneo-pubescens. *Inflorescentia* e basi folii oriens, pedunculo ad 2·5 cm. longo uti pedicellis ad 12 mm. longis calycibusque brunneo-piloso. *Calyx* ad basin in segmenta 5 lineari-oblonga 6 mm. longa (postico paullo breviore) divisus, pilis brunneo-apiculatis crassiusculis pubescens. *Corolla* fere 2 cm. longa, infundibuliformi-tubulosa, tubo 1 cm. longo leviter curvato superne ampliato; limbus obliquus 5-lobatus, lobo mediano 5 mm.

longo (palato 5 mm. longo) caeteris minoribus; superioribus ut videtur plus minusve reflexis; corollae faux intus superne longe pilosus. *Stamina* 5 mm. supra corollae basin inserta; filamenta 3 mm. longa; antherae loculis late divergentibus 1 mm. diametro. *Gynoecium* 1 cm. longum.

ABYSSINIA. Galla Sidama: Uollega, Ghidami, June 1939, *Pietro Benedetto* 453 (holo. FI).

This species was named *Streptocarpus phaeotrichus* by the late Dr. E. Chiovenda, but the name was never published nor is there any description of it amongst Chiovenda's manuscripts. I found the specimen in the Florence herbarium when working there for a few days in January 1959 and I am greatly indebted to the Curator, Dr. A. Moggi, for his help on that occasion and for sending the specimen on loan for more detailed study.

Streptocarpus phaeotrichus is a most interesting discovery, if one may use that word for a specimen that has been in the herbarium for twenty years. It is the first, and so far the only, species to be found in Abyssinia. There are species of *Streptocarpus* on Mt. Kenya and on Ruwenzori (though not on Mt. Elgon, so far as is known): but these are not closely allied to *S. phaeotrichus* nor, indeed, is *S. montanus* Oliv. which is known from the Teita Hills, Kilimanjaro and Usambara. One must go yet further south, to the Uluguru Mountains, to find a species of reasonably close affinity and even there the relationship is doubtful.

The material is inadequate to decide the habit of this species with certainty, but it seems that the stems arise from a slender rhizome; one fragment has two stems arising from it a centimetre or so apart. If this is so the habit would be similar to that of the Himalayan *Platystemma violoides*, or to small specimens of *Streptocarpus bullatus*, rather than to a small unifoliate species such as *S. pumilus*. Until further material is known it is unwise to be dogmatic about the affinities of the new species. The hairs on the upper side of the corolla-throat are multicellular in *S. phaeotrichus*, whereas those in *S. parensis* and *S. schliebenii* are unicellular (cf. Notes R.B.G. Edinb. xxii, 576: 1958).