

A JOURNAL ON TAXONOMIC BOTANY,
PLANT -SOCIOLOGY AND ECOLOGY

REINWARDTIA

Editors

MIEN A. RIFAI
KIJS WAT A KARTAWINATA
N. WULIJARNI-SOETJIPTO

¹ Published by

HERBARIUM BOGORIENSE
LEMBAGA BIO-LOGI NASIONAL — LIPI
BO.SOR, INDONESIA

Einwardtia Vol. 9, Part 1, 1—182 31 December 1974

10- ISSN 0(f34-365X

ORCHIDACEAE NOVAE VEL MINUS COGNITAE

H. G. JONES

P.O. Box 111, Bridgetown, Barbados

ABSTRACT

The new species *Cymbidium intermedium* from India is described, and critical morphological and nomenclatural notes on the Asiatic *Cirrho-petalum putidum* as well as the American *Hoffmannseggella crispilabia* and *Encyclia fragrana* are presented.

ABSTRAK

Jenis baru *Cymbidium intermedium* dari India dipertelakan untuk pertama kali. Disajikan pula catatan-catatan penting tentang morfologi dan tata nama anggrek Asia *Cirrhopetalum putidum* serta anggrek-anggrek Amerika *Hoffmannseggella crispilabia* dan *Encyclia fragrans*.

The following paper contains notes on four interesting species of the family Orchidaceae, one of which is described as new to science. The two Asiatic species turned up among a small collection of Indian orchids, which were imported from that country by the author in 1960, and subsequently flowered under cultivation in Barbados. The notes on the two tropical American species have resulted from preliminary studies undertaken for the purpose of preparing taxonomic revisions of the two genera to which these species belong.

Cymbidium intermedium H. G. Jones, *spec. nov.*

Epiphyticum robustum, erectum vel suberectum, usque ad 95 cm altum; radicibus brunneo-albidis, flexuosis glabris, rugulosis; pseudobulbis illis *Cymbidium* simulans similibus sed paulo minoribus, vagina foliifera arete amplectentibus; foliis erecto-patentibus vel suberectis, anguste linearibus, coriaceis, rigidulis, apice obtusis vel subacutis, leviter bilobis, usque ad 95 cm longis, medio ca 4 cm lato. Inflorescentia pendula, quam folio paulo brevior, racemosa, laxa multiflora, ca 90 cm longa, vagina florifera minuta, inter floribus ca 2.5 cm distantibus. Floribus expansi ca 4 cm diametribus, color flaveo-purpureis, illis *Cymbidium finlaysonianum* similibus sed paulo minoribus: sepalis angustis* oblongis, obtusis, ca 2 cm longis, medio ca 5 mm lato; petalis quam sepalia aequimagnis vix paulo brevioribus; labello trilobo, ca 19 cm longo, inter loborum lateralia expansi ca 1 cm lato; lobi laterali brevior, erecti, apici aequi, ca 1.5 cm longi; lobo mediano longiore, obtuso vel subacuto, apice

distinete recurvo; lamellis inter lobi laterali 2, continues, non interruptis; columna glabra, distincta curvata, ca 9 mm longa; anthera obtusa, apice leviter biloba; ovario cum pedicello cylindraceo, glahro, ca 2.5 cm lon go.

MATERIAL EXAMINED: (1) India, Bombay State, flowered under cultivation in Barbados, 1961. Herb. Jones. Misc. C/85 — Type. (2) Cultivated specimen from the island of Trinidad (origin unknown), 1967. Herb. Jones. Misc. C/280.

When I first examined the living flowers of this plant, I was completely baffled as to its identity; for they possessed the size and colouring of *C. simulans* Rolfe, but the form of the keels on the labellum was that of *C. finlaysonianum* Lindl. I first decided to use the latter name for the plant (Jones 1962), as most recent authors appear to agree in considering the form of the keels to be the decisive factor in separating these two concepts. However, *C. intermedium* possesses the combined characters of *C. simmlans* and *C. finlaysonianum* to such an extent that were these three plants at any time found growing together, I should not hesitate to declare *C. intermedium* to be a natural hybrid; but according to Santapau & Kapadia (1962), the only other species of *Cymbidium* known to occur in the Bombay State of India is *C. aloifolm* Sw. The flowers of *C. intermedium* are of a pale greenish-yellow colour, with purple markings on the petals and the labellum; the leaves are somewhat longer than those of *C. simulans* and *C. finlaysonianum*, but are of a softer, less leathery texture. The unidentified *Cymbidium* (GT 3580), which was published by Seidenfaden & Smitinand (1959-1965), is probably a large-flowered variety of this new species.

CIRRHOPETALUM PUTIDUM Tejj. & Binn.

Cirrhoptalum putidum Tejj. & Binn. in Tijds. Ned. I ml. 1: 311. 18C2. - *Bulbapkyum putidum* (Tejj. & Binn.) J.J. Sin. in Bull. Jard. hot. Baiteti!! II, 8: 27. 1913.

drkapetalum appendiculatuv, Rolfe in Kew. Bull. 25: 148. 1901. — *Bulbophyllum appendiculatum* (Rolfe) J.J. Sm. in Bull. Jard. bot. Buitenz. II, 5: 22. 1912.

Cirrhoptaltm fascinator Rolfe in Kew. Bull. 32: 69. 1B08. — *Bulbophyllum fuaciTiatar* (Rolfe) Rolfe in Bot. Majr. 134: 8199. 1H08.

This little plant also proved rather puzzling at first: shortly after it arrived in Barbados, it produced one flower-spike with a single flower, closely resembling *C. fascinator*, but much smaller; therefore my specimen was presumed to be the small-flowered *C. putidum*. Later, however, when the plant had become better-established, it produced more robust flower-spikes, with 2-3 larger flowers, of the size of *C. fascinator*.

Seidenfaden (1972) has pointed out that the two concepts known as *C. putidum* and *C. fascinator* are "exactly alike in all details of the flowers, except for size"; but now that it is known that both large and small flowers can be borne on the same plant, there appears to be no justification for maintaining *C. fascinator* as a distinct species. The unidentified *Cirrhoptalum* which was illustrated in colour in a recent Russian publication (Paddubnaya-Amol'di & Selezneva 1957) also belongs here.

Regardless of what specific name they have adopted, the majority of recent taxonomists who have dealt with this concept — known variously as *C. putidum*, *C. appendiculatum* and *C. fascinator* — have listed it under the generic name *B-idbopkyllum*. However, I am in agreement with the view expressed by Hunt & Summerhayes (1966), that the genus *Cirrhoptalvsn* should be reinstated, rather than merged in *Bulbophyllum*. Rolfe's *C. appendiculatum* was based upon a specimen, which had been published by King & Pantling (1898) as *C. ornatissimum* — but which differed from the true *C. ornatissimum* Rchb. f. The latter concept is closely related to *C. pitidum*, but is easily distinguished by its broader leaves, shorter flower-scapes, bearing 5-6 flowers, and the broader floral segments. A good illustration of *C. ornatissimum* has been published by Latif (1960).

HOFFMANNSEGGELLA CEISPILABIA (A. Rich.) H. G. Jones

Laetia cripilabia A. Rich. ex Rehb. f. Xcn. Orch. 2: 61. 1863. - *Hefftmittleggelm cripilabia* (A. Rich.) H. G. Jones in Bradea I: 266. 1972.
BMit cripilabiu Rchb. f. Xen. Orch. 2: 61. 1863.

There appears to be some doubt as to the correct citation of the author's name for the plant formerly known as *Laelia cripilabia*. This name was originally given to a specimen in the herbarium of Louis Claude and Achille Richard (Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris) by the latter botanist; but the species remained unpublished at the time of the author's death in 1852. Reichenbach subsequently published a description of the plant under the name *Bletia cripilabia*, but he also cited the original name and its author in his diagnosis. In 1875, Warner took up the name *Laelia cripilabia* A. Rich. in the second volume of his *Select Orchidaceous Plants*, and all subsequent authors who have dealt with the species have cited the authority for the name as „A. Rich. ex Warn.“

From recent correspondence with the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, I gather that there is some doubt there as to whether the correct citation

for the name *Laelia crispiloma* should be "(Rchb. f.) Warn." or "(Rchb. f.) A. Rich, ex Warn." However, in view of the fact that Reichenbach did publish the name *Laelia crispilabia*, with A. Richard as its author, in 1863, and since Warner's publication did not appear until some twelve years later, I have decided to use the citation, "A. Rich, ex Rchb. f." for this name.

Judging from the correspondence dated July 1911, between Rolfe and Gagnepain, preserved at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Rolfe seems to have suspected that some of the later examples which found their way into the Paris herbarium under the name *L. crispilabia* A. Rich, were, in fact, examples of *L. flava* Tindl. This may well be so, but I think there can be no doubt that *H. crispilabia* (A. Rich.) H. G. Jones is amply distinct from *H. flava* (Lindl.) H. G. Jones: the holotype specimen of the former concept is rather fragmentary; but this may be supplemented by more recent collections — notably the one illustrated in colour by Hoehne (1949). The genus *Hoffmannseggella* was established by the present writer (Jones 1968b) to accommodate the species formerly assigned to the section *Cyrtolaelia* Schltr. of the genus *Laelia* Lindl.

ENCYCLIA FRAGRANS (SW.) Lemée

Epidendrivi fragrant: Sw., Prodr.: 123. 1788. - *Encyclia fragrant* (Sw.) Lemée, Fl. Guy. Fran. 1: 418. 1855.

Epidendrum lineatum Salisb., Prodr.: ID. 1796.

Epidendrum bulbosum Veil., Flor. Flum. 9: 11. 1827.

Epidendrum cordatum Veil., Flor. Flum. 9: 38. 1827.

Epidendrum papillo Veil., Flor. Flum. 9: 28. 1827.

Epidendrum vespa Veil., Flor. Flum. 9: 27. 1827.

Epidendrum aemulum Lindl., Bat. Reg. 22: 1898. 1838.

Epidendrum vaffinatam Sesse & Mocifio, Fl. Me*. 2: 201. 1894.

Ewsiyelia fragrant ssp. *acmula* Dressier in Phytoogia 21: 440. 1971.

In my paper on Trinidad orchids (Jones 1968a) I gave the original place of publication for the name *Encyella fragrans* as "Dressier, Brittonia 13: 264. 1961", where this name was, indeed, presented as a "new combination"; but Dressier had, apparently, overlooked the fact that the same name had already been published by Lemée, some six years before. In my paper referred to, I followed traditional usage and included the names *Epidendrum aemulum* Lindl. and *E. lambada* Linden in the synonymy of *E. fragrans*, in spite of the fact that I was not too happy about *E. lambada*. However, this reduction had previously been made by a number of other taxonomists, who had at their disposal vast herbaria, with many more specimens than were available to me; therefore I believed that they were in a better position to make this decision.

Since the publication of my article, two more papers have been published by Dressier (1971a, 1971b) in which *E. aemulum* and *E. lambada* were once again separated from *E. fragrans*, as a subspecies and a species respectively. In the light of information contained in these two studies I have had another look at the *E. fragrans* complex, as a result of which I have decided to accept Dressier's view in regard to *E. lambada*. However, I have seen so many examples of *E. fragrans* in which the characters of that concept and of *E. aemula*, as illustrated by Dressier, appear to be hopelessly mixed up, that I am still not convinced that the latter can be separated as a variety, much less a distinct subspecies. I have, therefore, included Dressier's latest new combination in the synonymy of *E. fragrans*.

REFERENCES

- DKESSI.KB, K. L. 1961. A reconsideration of *Encyelia* (Orchiraceae). In Brittonia 13: 253-286.
- DBESSLEE, R. L. 1971 a. Nomenclature] notes on the Orchidaceae. IV. In Phytoogia 21: 440-443.
- DRESSLER, R. L. 1971b. El complejo de *Encyelia fragrant* en los Países Andinos. In Orquídeologia 6: 195-203.
- HOEHNE, F. C. 1949. *Iconografía de Orchidaceas do Brazil*. Secretaria de Agricultura São Paulo.
- HUNT, P. F. & SUMMEBHAYES, V. S. 1966. Notes on Asiatic Orchids. IV. In Kew Bull. 20: 51-61.
- JONES, H. G. 1962. The culture of orchid species in the West Indies. XI. *la Orchid Rev.* 70: 146-147.
- JONES, H. G. 1968a. Notes on a collection of orchids from the West Indian Island of Trinidad. In Candollea 23: 295-299.
- JONES, H. G. 1968b. Studies in neotropical orchidology. In Act. Bot. Acad. So. Hung. 14: 63-70.
- JONES, H. G. 1972. Orchidaceae austroamericanae. In BradBa 1: 263-266.
- KING, G. & PANTLINO, R. 1898. *The orchids of the Sikkim-Himalaya*. Bengal Secretariat Press, Calcutta.
- LATIK, S. M. 1960. *Bunga anggerik permata belantara Indonesia*. N.V. Mrj Vorkink - Van Hooze, Bandung.
- PODDL-BKAYA - AENOL'IH, V. A. & SELEZNEVA, V. A. 1957. *Orchidei i ich kaVtura*. Izdatel'stvo Akademii Naut, Moscow.
- SANTAPAD, H. & KAPADIA, Z. 1962. Critical notes on the Orchidaceae of Bombay State. IX. 7(J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 59: 382-404.
- SEIDENFADEK, G. 1972. Contributions to the Orchid Flora of Thailand. IV. In Bot. Tids. B7: 76-127.
- SEIDENFADEN, G. & SMITINAND, T. 1959—1965. *The Orchids of Thailand*. The Siam Society, Bangkok.

	Page
HATTINK, T. A. A revision of Malesian <i>Caesalpinia</i> , including <i>Mezoneuroji</i> (Legummosae-Caesalpiniaeeae)	1
• JONES, H. G. Orchidaceae navae vel minus coglitae	71
KENG, H. Rediscovery of <i>Cheilothea malayana</i> and the identity of <i>Cheilothea</i> , <i>Audresia</i> and <i>Mo.notropastmm</i> (Ericaceae- Monotropeoideae)	77
KOSTERMANS, A. J. G. H. A monograph of the genus- <i>Neōanna-</i> <i>momum</i> Liou Ho	85
—————Materials for a revision of Lauraceae IV	97
r? —————A new Bornean species of <i>Mammea</i>	117
————— <i>Triadodapkne</i> , a. new Jauraceous genua from Borneo	119
—————A monograph of <i>Caryodaphnopsis</i> A. Shaw	123
LARSEN, K. & LAKSEN, S. K. A new <i>Amorphophallus</i> from Thailand	139
NAYAK, M. P. A revision of <i>Phtkiandra</i> (Melastomataceae)	143
RAO, A. N. & LEONG, F. L. Pollen morphology of certain tropical plants	153
SKVORTIZOV, B. V. On some colourless flagellates from Java and Brasil	177

Distributor

BIBLIOTHECA BOGORIENSIS,
JALAN RAYA JUANDA 20,
BOGOK, INDONESIA