

New and Interesting Records of African Plants

by

Various Authors

ASCLEPIADACEAE

A NEW COMBINATION IN SCHIZOGLOSSUM

Bullock, in Kew Bull. 1952 : 417 (1952), proposed the upholding of the generic status of *Stenostelma* to accommodate *S. capense* Schltr. (= *Schizoglossum aciculare* N.E.Br.) and the closely related species *Stenostelma corniculatum* (E. Mey.) Bullock.

Huber, in Prodr. Fl. S.W.Afr. 114 : 52 (1967), transferred *Stenostelma capense* Schltr. to *Schizoglossum capense* (Schltr.) Huber.

The latter classification appears preferable and it thus becomes necessary to transfer *Stenostelma corniculatum* (*Lagarinthus corniculatus* E. Mey.) also to *Schizoglossum* with synonymy as follows:

***Schizoglossum corniculatum* (E. Mey.) R. A. Dyer, comb. nov.**

Lagarinthus corniculatus E. Mey., Comm. 208 (1837).

Gomphocarpus corniculatus (E. Mey.) Dietr., Syn. Pl. 2 : 901 (1840).

Krebsia corniculata (E. Mey.) Schltr. in Bot. Jahrb. 20, Beibl. 51 : 41 (1895); N.E.Br. in Fl. Cap. 4, 1 : 587 (1907). (*Krebsia* Harv. 1868, not of Eckl. & Zeyh., 1836).

Stenostelma corniculatum (E. Mey.) Bullock in Kew Bull. 1952 : 417 (1952).

R. A. DYER.

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN DUVALIA AND HUERNIA

In an article published earlier in this volume, pp. 45 - 54 (1969), L. C. Leach transferred *Duvalia tanganyikensis* Bruce & Bally, *D. procumbens* R. A. Dyer and *D. andreaeana* Rauh to the genus *Huernia*. In the absence of any published comment it could be construed that the changes met with general agreement. For my part this is not so.

It has been pointed out by various authors that distinctions between genera of the Stapelieae are often arbitrary. A close study makes it fairly clear that there is no sharp distinction between the two genera *Duvalia* and *Huernia* as at present constituted. On the other hand the respective type species *D. elegans*

(Masson) Haw. and *Huernia campanulata* (Masson) R.Br. leave no room for confusion. There is no call for the amalgamation of the two genera and the problem is to select the most natural line of distinction.

N. E. Brown in Fl. Cap. 4, 1: 526 (1907) used the presence of teeth between the corolla-lobes as a distinctive character for *Huernia*. He went on to describe the outer corona as spreading upon and more or less adnate to the bottom of the corolla-tube and the inner corona as arising from the upper part of the staminal column, of 5 simple lobes incumbent upon the backs of the anthers and equalling or exceeding them, subulate or clavate or thickened at the apex, often with a slight transverse dorsal ridge at their base but *no crest, wing or dorsal horn*.

In the case of *Duvalia*, N. E. Brown described the corona as arising near the top of the staminal column and stipitate, and the inner corona-lobes as turgid, ovoid, more or less pointed at each end, subhorizontal, with the *dorsal point usually somewhat raised* and the inner closely incumbent on the backs of the anthers and sometimes longer than them but not produced into erect points.

Leach tabulates the four main characters on which he relies to distinguish the two genera, characters present in *Duvalia* and absent in *Huernia*: Corona stipitate; denticles (usually) at base of leaves; corolla (usually) replicate; corolla lobes (usually) ciliate. He lists known exceptions to the last three of these characters in *Duvalia*, and it still remains to be seen whether *Duvalia maculata* N. E. Brown var *imaculata* Luckhoff is an exception in not having the stipitate corona normally found in *Duvalia*.

Duvalia tanganyikensis, *D. procumbens* and *D. andreaeana* are excluded from *Duvalia* and placed by Leach in *Huernia*, because the coronas are not stipitate, the stem-teeth (rudimentary leaves) are devoid of denticles at the base and the corolla-lobes are neither replicate nor ciliate, although he allows other species without these characters to remain in *Duvalia*.

Leach omits, as not being diagnostic, (a) intermediate corolla-lobes, as occurring in both genera to some extent, although usually much more prominent in *Huernia*; (b) corona shape, since, as he says, the outline of the outer corona and the form of the inner lobes are closely matched in both genera.

It is in our interpretation of the importance of the structure of the inner corona-lobes that we differ most. Leach, p. 54, points out that there is considerable variation in the inner corona of *D. procumbens* and, in his words, the lobes may be either widely spreading with the inner face somewhat channelled, or strictly erect and more or less triangular in cross-section. What Leach is describing is not the inner face of the lobe but the upper face of its dorsal prolongation. His figure, p. 47, shows this very nicely. This dorsal prolongation is quite foreign to the genus *Huernia*, as stressed by N. E. Brown. Leach is in further error, therefore, in saying at the foot of p. 46 that his rearrangement requires no amendment to the existing generic circumscription of *Huernia*.

In an effort to tidy up the genus *Duvalia*, Leach has introduced exceptions into *Huernia* where none existed before. None of *Duvalia tanganyikensis*, *D. procumbens* or *D. andreaeana* has teeth between the corolla-lobes; in none is the inner coronal-lobe limited to the presence of a transverse dorsal ridge and all have a dorsal prolongation of the inner corona-lobe giving them the characteristic *Duvalia* appearance. Bruce, Bally and Rauh expressed no doubt in placing their species in *Duvalia* where, together with *D. procumbens*, they should remain.

Huernia verekeri Stent var. *pauciflora* Leach, the controversial species, does appear to show a tendency towards *Duvalia* but does not quite reach the borderline in the dorsal development of its inner corona-lobes and should remain in *Huernia* as concluded by Leach.

R. A. DYER.