genus; 52 species are recognized here, no less than 13 of them being described for the first time. Only five of these are species from the winter rainfall area of the Cape, where the genus is most richly developed; the other eight are all from the Eastern Cape north to the Transvaal, the area of summer rainfall. This distribution of new species reflects the fact that the genus has been sadly neglected in the northern part of its range, a fact not unusual in genera that have their centre of diversity in the winter-rainfall area further south. The watsonias of the northern area still require more careful collecting and study, as the author himself is aware (see his notes on *W. pulchra*, p. 82). Perhaps *W. confusa* will also prove to deserve closer study; certainly the remark 'seldom above 1500m

One practice that cannot be commended is the introduction in a printed work of names that are not taken into use and have previously only appeared on herbarium labels. Here we find *W. parvifolia* Lewis under *W. paucifolia* (p. 56), *W. tysonii* L. Bolus under *W. inclinata* (p. 67), *W. elegans* N. E. Br. and *W. imbricata* N. E. Br. under *W. pulchra* (p. 81) and these last two are actually used as handles in describing the variation of the species. This is simply inviting future confusion. If it is necessary to mention a name to dispose of its use on distributed herbarium sheets this can easily be done: for example 'Brown used the epithet *elegans* on some specimens included here under *W. pulchra*'. If that is not necessary, manuscript names should be left entombed in the herbarium. One specific name requires comment: *W. vanderspuyiae*. On the analogy of *Vanda lindleyana* (ICBN Rec. 73Cc) this should be corrected to *W. vanderspuyae*, which is how Mrs Bolus originally spelt it.

Both books are set in double columns, but otherwise the production is good and the misprints that I have noted are not serious enough to warrant comment. Taken together these revisions represent another valuable step forward in the classification of southern African Iridaceae.

B. L. BURTT

Supplement to the Flora of Turkey\*. The culmination of fifty years' work on the flora of the Middle East by Professor P. H. Davis was marked by a Symposium at Edinburgh on the flora of South-West Asia at which his friends and colleagues celebrated the imminent publication of this Supplement to the Flora of Turkey. There is, of course, no easily defined end point to reach with a Supplement as there is with a Flora, and the timely completion of the Supplement is all the more extraordinary when one remembers that P. D. and his assistant editors Robert Mill and Kit Tan finished the project without the benefit of Research Council funding which terminated in 1985.

One of the most noteworthy features of the Supplement is the evidence it presents of the powerful stimulus given to Turkish botanists by the publication of this foreign-edited Flora. It is hard to appreciate, from a north-west European viewpoint, what a major obstacle existed to understanding Turkey's own flora when so many of the previously published treatments (written in a plethora of foreign languages) were based on hastily snatched and often inadequately localised plants of the kind which, to quote P. D.'s own words, were '... decapitated by British Consuls riding fast to Trebizond' (Hints for Hard-Pressed Collectors, *Watsonia* 4(6): 283, 1961).

The need for a Supplement was forseen in the 1960s, and was formally announced at the 2nd OPTIMA meeting in Florence in a paper later published in *Webbia* 34: 135 (1979). Its scope was redefined when detailed plans for the volume were made, not least because it was found to be impractical to compile the thousands of published and unpublished grid square records which were made in recent years. The emphasis given to improvements in the taxonomy of groups treated in the Flora is appropriate, since it provides a more workable framework for future distributional studies.

Certain authors' treatments get short shrift. Whereas, in *Acantholimon*, F. K. Meyer's four new species from the Flora area are given only a brief mention under *A. ulicinum*, his numerous new species of *Thlaspi* (many placed in new segregate genera) are at least listed under un-numbered headings using the combinations in *Thlaspi* made by Greuter and Burdet. J. Ponert fares slightly better, in that one species of *Astragalus* is accepted 'with reluctance' (anyone puzzled by the tartness of this comment should consult A. Huber-Morath's paper in *Bauhinia* 5: 153, 1975), but with well over a page devoted to a demolition of Ponert's 250 other combinations and novelties this hardly represents an endorsement of his scientific method.

The chapter devoted to 'Additional taxonomic literature' (pp. 255-316) updates the floristic bibliography published in 1979 and includes over six pages of references to the non-vascular

\*P. H. Davis, R. R. Mill and Kit Tan (eds). Flora of Turkey and the East Aegean Islands (Supplement), vol. 10. Pp. xxi+590. ISBN 0852245599. Edinburgh University Press, 1988. Price £70

cryptogamic flora of Turkey. There follow, in smaller type, more than 100 pages of information on chromosome numbers of plants of Turkish origin. Some compression would have been appropriate; interested readers could be expected to consult the source references for details.

As a former assistant editor of the *Flora of Turkey*, I was conscious when first dipping into the Supplement that it provided a chance to rectify some of the less obvious defects in the earlier volumes of the *Flora* itself. One of these was the lack of typifications of the collections of Joseph Pitton de Tournefort, whose *Corollarium* (1703) described so many Turkish species for the first time. Even though Tournefort's names are pre-Linnean, the species they represent were frequently taken up by later authors such as J. C. D. von Schreber (referring to collections made by Tournefort's companion Gundelsheimer), C. Willdenow and others. I would have welcomed an attempt to typify them and to correct errors of citation such as 'Polygala supina Schreb., Dec. 19 (1776)' (*Flora of Turkey*: 1: 534, 1965). It is a matter for regret that this was not done, as the *Flora of Turkey* will never be superseded as a sourcebook for typifications.

Such minor quibbles aside, the Supplement represents a masterful summation of the whole Flora of Turkey project; twelve statistical tables on pp. 429–551 present information by family on numbers of genera and species and of generic and specific endemism, as well as on specific and infraspecific endemism within genera and a short but intriguing section on hybrids. Without determination bordering on obsession there would not have been a Flora of Turkey to celebrate, and botanists near and far will be grateful for the efforts of all those at Edinburgh who helped to bring this about.

J. R. Edmondson