

Ruellia rosea and as such it stands, whether or not *Arrhoxystylon roseum* is the same.* If they prove to be different then it is the latter which will need a new name on transference to *Ruellia*. Similarly Hemsley's *R. rosea*, based on *Ophthalmacanthus roseus* Nees, will have to be renamed if it is to be maintained as a species of *Ruellia*.

Ruellia rosea Bull, Retail list of new beautiful and rare plants [= "Catalogue"], 1878, 8, and 1879, 44; Kew Bull. Add. Ser. iv, 352 (1900); Chittenden in R.H.S. Dict. Gard. iv, 1839 (1951)—nec *R. rosea* Wall. List No. 7154 (1832) nomen et ex Nees in DC. Prodr. xi, 177 (1847), in syn.; nec *R. rosea* (Nees) Hemsl. Biol. Centr. Amer. Bot. ii, 507 (1881-2).

Syn.: ?*R. rosea* Mart. (Obs. MSS. No. 1089) ex Nees in Mart. Fl. Bras. ix, 61 (1847), in syn., et in DC. Prodr. xi, 215 (1847), in syn.
? *Arrhoxystylon roseum* Nees in Mart. Fl. Bras. ix, 61 (1847).

As some of these nurserymen's catalogues are relatively inaccessible, it may be useful to quote Bull's description in full. There is a specimen, preserved at the time, in the Kew herbarium and this may be taken as the type of the species.

"A pretty Acanthad of free-growing habit, introduced from Brazil. It has bluntly quadrangular stems with opposite, oblong-elliptic leaves. The inflorescence is axillary on winged petioles (sic), bearing a small cyme of 4-6 flowers the calyx of which is cut into 5 linear divisions of unequal length. The corolla is of a beautiful bright rosy pink or mauve, with a curved tube $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch long and a spreading limb about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch across, consisting of 5 roundish emarginate lobes, each half an inch across. It is a free-growing, free-blooming plant and can scarcely fail to be a favourite; for although the flowers are fugacious they are of a most attractive and pleasing colour. 10s. 6d."

* From description Nees' plant seems to be more shrubby in habit and to have smaller blunter leaves. Otherwise the description would fit well with the cultivated plant.

Camellia Paintings (review)*.—"This book is intended to be the first of a series of volumes on the Camellia and the purpose of the work is to make available to those of moderate means a series of flower books of artistic merit and literary interest." That quotation from the Foreword should also be read as a rider to the title, *The Camellia*, which might otherwise seem somewhat presumptuous, for this particular volume only deals with *C. sinensis*, *C. x williamsii* 'J. C. Williams' and 18 forms of *C. japonica*. The editor goes on to affirm her personal faith in the superiority of artist over colour-photograph, and her courage in setting artists to work on original illustrations is highly creditable. We have seen in recent years too many flower books reproducing once again the paintings of Redouté,

* The Camellia, edited by Beryl Leslie Urquhart. Leslie Urquhart Press, Sharpthorne, Sussex, 1956. Folio, 20 pp., 20 coloured illustrations each with one leaf of text. Price £3, 15s.

Ehret and others, as though these alone were worthy of publication. Nothing can have been more discouraging to living artists; but the two whose work is reproduced here, Paul Jones and Raymond Booth, have not only seized their opportunity but have the good fortune to see their paintings beautifully reproduced. The illustration of *C. x williamsii* lends point to the belief expressed in the text that this is one of the really good horticultural introductions of recent years. Others, such as those of *C. japonica* 'Incarnata' and 'Reine des Beautés', capture the prim hard outline which seems to have pleased an earlier generation—perhaps because they thought more of the elegant buttonhole than the flowering shrub?

The way the Camellia fell from favour in the latter half of the last century and its steady revival since about 1930 is a remarkable instance of the changing fashions in horticulture; but it would be a mistake to think that it has regained just the same form of popularity. In its previous heyday the Camellia was a greenhouse plant and, as Mrs. Urquhart tells us in the informative Introduction, the nurserymen of the time had enormous glasshouses growing nothing but Camellias. Now, however, its popularity depends on its hardiness outdoors, and it is already clear that many Camellias will resist frost better than some rhododendrons as yet more widely grown. Incidentally the Camellia has changed in another way since its revival. In the last century the tea plant was known as *Thea sinensis* and the Camellias were purely ornamental plants as far as western civilization was concerned. In the interval botanists have decided that the genus *Thea* cannot be kept distinct from *Camellia* and the tea plant is now known as *Camellia sinensis*. This enables authors on Camellia to give their books a practical flavour with some information on the tea trade and this Mrs. Urquhart does, as well as according *C. sinensis* place of honour as the first species illustrated.

The text accompanying each plate consists of name and synonyms, a brief description, history and notes, the latter having been provided by various enthusiastic Camellia growers. All this does not add up to very much and the two sides of a folio page available for text are seldom fully occupied, often barely one side is filled. One would not wish to encourage mere padding, but the fact remains that the present text gives the impression of being pathetically meagre.

The Camellia is a folio volume published at £3, 15s.; at that price it represents a value in illustrated flower-books which it is not easy to match. One criticism in format, however, cannot be passed over. There is no list of contents, no index, and beyond the introduction neither pages of text nor plates are numbered. The only way to find anything, or to find out if it is there, is to turn the pages. It is to be hoped that the next volume of the series will not only have this fault corrected, but will indicate how the present volume should be numbered so that an eventual index may be compiled.

B. L. BURTT.