



Dæmonorops confusus Furtado. Type.

fruit-scales arranged in 12 (not 15–16) vertical series, by its leaf-sheaths which show no gibbosity below the petiole and which have very few small laminar or criniform bristles, and by its leaflets which have a midrib usually armed for the greater part in the lower, and only a small terminal portion in the upper, surface.

5. *Dæmonorops confusus* Furtado spec. nov.

D. propinquus Becc. in Hook. f. Fl. Brit. Ind. VI (1893) 467 et in Calc. Ann. XII (1911) 111 quoad specimen sumatrense a Forbesio lectum et in Tabula 45 depictum?

D. draco Willd. *sensu* Bl. Rumphia (1845) quoad tab. 132? Plate 38.

Caudex scandens, robustus, cum vagina 2.5–3.5 cm. in diam. ut videtur. Frondis *vagina* infra petiolum gibbosa, aculeis inæquialtis: longissimis paucis, robustis, ad 3 cm. longis, elasticis, plus minusve deflexis, laminaribus, sæpe laciniatis, plerumque solitariis, e basi latis apicem versus angustatis, summo subulatis; alteris multoties brevioribus, consimilibus, plurimis, inter priores positis, solitariis vel interdum confluentibus armatissima. *Petiolus* supra applanatus, aculeis ad 1.5 cm. longis, solitariis vel basin versus transverse confluentibus armatus, subtus convexus, aculeis paucioribus plerumque solitariis. *Lamina* magna, in cirrhum longum unguibus ad 7–fidis armatum transiens; ad rhacheos dorsum unguibus 1–3–fidis, reflexis prædita, supra parce aculeolata. *Segmenta* numerosa, subæquidistantia, alternantia vel subopposita, in parte terminali in greges ex segmentis binis vel pluribus sæpe approximata, plicatula, elliptico-lanceolata, utrinque subito attenuata, secus costam mediam utrinque parce aculeolata, subtus pallidiora, secus margines spinulosa, apice longe acuta vel acuminata, setosa, venis transversis indistinctis, 2–3.5, interdum 5.5 cm. inter se dissita, 25–35 cm. longa, 2 cm. lata. *Spadix foemineus* fructiferus tantum visus, cum pedunculo ancipiti 5 cm. longo secus margines armato 50 cm. longus. *Spathae* primariae ignotæ, spathellis perbrevibus annularibus apice liguliformibus. *Rami* primarii circ. 5, in spiculas alternantes ad 5 cm. longas divisi. *Involucrophorum* tri- vel quadrangulare, pedicelliforme, clavatum, 1 cm. longum. *Involucrum* 2–4 mm. longum, obconicum, apice truncatum ad 5 mm. in diam., vertice concavum; areola oblonga involucrophoro fere æquilonga. *Perianthium* fructiferum explanatum. *Fructus* oblongus, longe mucronulatus, sine mucrone 2–3 mm. alto circ. 20–22 mm. longus, 17–19 mm. in diam., squamis secus mediam canaliculatis, per series verticales 18–20 imbricatis, resina atro-purpurea vernicosis. *Semen* ovoideum, profunde ruminatum, 1.3 mm. longum, 1.2 mm. in diam.; embryone basilari.

SUMATRA: Bandar Baru on Gunong Sibayak (Nur 7308. Type in Singapore).

The photographic plate 45 in the *Calcutta Annals XII* represents a Sumatran plant collected by Forbes under n. 2287 and preserved in the Calcutta herbarium. Beccari has identified it as *D. propinquus*, from which it differs in several characters; for, to quote from my notes made of the duplicate preserved at Kew, the leaflets in it may be described as elliptic lanceolate, while in *D. propinquus* they are much longer (40–45 cm.), broader (2–3.5 cm.), ensiform, gradually narrowing towards the apex. The involucrophore in Forbes's specimen is much longer than in the type of *D. propinquus*. The outer spathe shows slender spines, solitary or in groups, mostly along the two dorsal carinæ and margins, without any tendency to align themselves in transverse series, though they may be linked vertically by the fibres of the carinæ and the margins. In Griffith's specimen referred here to *D. propinquus* the outer spathe is much more rigid and woody and has not any prominent dorsal carinæ. Its spines too are often transversely digitate and coalesce sometimes to form interrupted horizontal series.

Forbes's specimen appears to belong to *D. confusus*, though owing to a great difference in the development between its spadix and that of the type of *D. confusus*, and also owing to the absence of the outer spathe in the latter, I cannot be sure of the determination. The leaflets and the armature on the petiole and the sheath agree very well with those in Nur's specimen. I did not have the latter with me at the time I made notes of Forbes's specimen, but looking at Beccari's plate, I note that the peduncle in that of Forbes is armed all round and with more spines, whereas in Nur's it is (very sparingly) armed only along the two margins. But such variations may sometimes be found even in one and the same species.

Blume's plate 132 in *Rumphia* (1845) appears to belong here, though Beccari (*op. cit.* p. 107) was inclined to regard it as the real *D. draco* (Willd.) Bl. According to Beccari's interpretation I take *D. draco* to be a species with small seriate bristles on the sheath (more or less as in *D. dracunculus* Ridl.) and short involucrophores (as in *D. propinquus*). Blume's plate 132 does not in any way satisfy these two conditions. The armature on the outer spathe in the plate appears moreover to be like the one in Forbes's specimen preserved in the Kew Herbarium.