

# Additional Observation on *Corybas taiwanensis* Lin & Lu (Orchidaceae)

Jenn-Che Wang and Yu-Chuan Lu

Department of Biology, National Taiwan Normal University  
Taipei, Taiwan 117, Republic of China

## ABSTRACT

*Corybas taiwanensis* Lin & Lu was originally based on a single plant collected from northern Taiwan. This species was recently recollected from central part by the second author. A more detailed observation and comparison with original description as well as type specimen were carried out. The authors' collections were little different from the type specimen in having cuspidate leaf apex, spathulate upper sepal with caudate tip and free lateral sepals. However, both were similar on the whole. Those differences were considered to be the variation between populations.

**Keywords:** *Corybas taiwanensis*, Orchidaceae, Taiwan

The genus *Corybas* contains about 60 species distributed from Himalayas eastward to the Philippines and south to Australia and New Zealand (Lin, 1975). Taiwan locates on its northern distributional margin. However, it was not found from Taiwan until Lin reported *C. taiwanensis* in 1975, which was based on a single plant collected by Mr. S. Y. Lu from Taoyuan Hsien, northern Taiwan. No plant was recollected thereafter. The treatment in Flora of Taiwan (Liu and Su, 1979) was also based on Lin (1975). Therefore, this species was considered to be rare in Taiwan (e.g. Hsu and Lu, 1984; Hsu, 1987; Lai, 1991). Recently, the second author made a field trip to Shan-lin-shi (杉林溪) forest recreation area, Nantou Hsien, where she found a population about 40-50 plants of this species growing on mossy rocky slope along the trail in the forest garden. Among them, about 20 were flowering. A more detailed observation was able to be done and some differences were found when compared with the original description as well as the type specimen. Thus an addendum is described as follows:

***Corybas taiwanensis* Lin & Lu** in *Taiwania* 20:162, *pl.* 1. 1975; Liu & Su in H. L. Li *et al.*, *Fl. Taiwan* 5:932, *pl.* 1568. 1978. 紅盤蘭 (Fig. 1)

Small terrestrial herb. Stem erect, terete, divided into two separated parts by a node; the lower part pilose, 5mm long or longer, 1-2 mm in diameter; the upper part glabrous, 3-10 mm long, 1-2 mm in diameter, with a scale like cataphyll on the node. Leaf solitary, sessile, cordate, 0.9-1.4 cm long, 0.8-1.4 cm wide, cuspidate at apex, cordate at base, entire on margin, chartaceous, glabrous on both surfaces; venation palmate or near so. Flower terminal, solitary, sessile or subsessile; bract

narrowly triangular, 5-6 mm long, ca. 1.5 mm wide at base, acuminate at apex; ovary 2.5-3 mm long, with purplish-red strip on surface; upper sepal spathulate, incurved, 1.5 cm long, ca. 3.5 mm wide at base, 7 mm wide near apex, terminal part irregularly serrulate on the margin with a 1-2.5 mm long, caudate tip; lateral sepals and petals diverged from the ventral base of labelum, filiform, 2.6-3 cm long; labelum rather large, tubular, anterior half strongly recurved and dilated into a broad limb; disc orbicular in outline from front view, 1.1-1.3 cm wide, with several parallel dark red strips, scabrous on upper surface along strips, fimbriate on the front margin; spur deeply bilobed, dark red, 5mm long, straight or slightly curved outward and horn-like; column oblong, ca. 3mm long; pollinia 4, in pairs, yellow, granular, ca. 1mm long; viscid disc elliptic; stigma protruding, cupular.

**Specimen examined :** Nantou Hsien, Shan-lin-shi (杉林溪), *Y. C. Lu* 1528. June 17, 1994 (TNU).

When compared with the original description and the type specimen (*S. Y. Leu* 2093, TAI!), the authors found that their collections were different from *C. taiwanensis* (*sensu* Lin & Lu) in having cuspidate leaf apex, spathulate upper sepal with irregularly serrulate anterior margin and a caudate tip, and free lateral sepals (Table 1). However, they were similar on the whole. It is possibly that those differences are the variation between populations. Especially when the authors considered the facts that Lin's description was based on a single plant and the long distance between these two collections. Therefore, the authors treated them as identity.