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A bibliographical account of L’Hérîtier’s "Stirpes novae"

Günther Buchheim

_Stripes novae, aut minus cognitae_ by Charles-Louis L’Hérîtier de Brutelle (1746-1800), is a late 18th century broadsheet work with many excellent engraved plates, among them the first examples of botanical work executed by the famous botanical artists Pierre-Joseph Redouté (1759-1840) and James Sowerby (1757-1822). A great number of new taxa are described in it, and it has been long held in high esteem by bibliophiles and botanists alike. Without any doubt, this publication is to be classified among those works which Sacheverell Sitwell and Wilfrid Blunt (1956) have so aptly defined as “Great flower books.”

Copies of this work have been repeatedly exhibited, e.g., in recent years at the Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1949); Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1952); City Art Museum, St. Louis, Mo. (1959); Hunt Botanical Library, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1963); National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh (1964). One copy is on permanent display at the library of the Linnean Society, London. To call it a “rare” book as implicitly was done by H. H. Bartlett in the catalogue of the exhibition at the Clements Library (1949) is perhaps not fully justified since I know of 44 copies, nearly all of them held by public libraries. But be that as it may, _Stirpes novae_ certainly is a much rewarding item for a bibliographical study. Being published in fascicles over a span of several years and remaining unfinished, due to L’Hérîtier’s loss of fortune during the French Revolution, it has attracted many writers in the past 75 years to determine its exact dates of publication and the contents of the instalments; the dates on the title-page and on the fascicle titles being incorrect. Although these efforts have been quite successful, not all the problems are yet solved. In addition, the work shows several characteristics which are variable, sometimes from copy to copy, and therefore only an extensive treatment seems to be adequate to cope with the complexity involved.

The present study is based on the evaluation of 31 copies, 27 seen by myself; the data for the remaining four copies were obtained by correspondence. A few data on additional copies not seen are taken from published
bibliographical literature. For assistance received in the course of this investigation, I am indebted to Dr. G. B. Van Schaack, Missouri Botanical Garden, St. Louis, Mo., and to my colleagues, Dr. C. Weber and Mrs. N. G. Smith. Furthermore, my thanks are extended also to Mr. A. A. Bullock, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, and Mr. P. Stageman, Lindley Library, Royal Horticultural Society, London, for supplementary information provided on the copies held by their respective institutions.

The arrangement of the material presented below is in three sections: letterpress, plates, and data referring to both.

LETTERPRESS

1. Transcription of the Title-Page (see also Fig. 11)


2. Collation

1°: i-93 ±94 95-104; 104 unsigned leaves (+6 fascicle titles); [2] i-ii v vi vii viii ix x-xvi 1-75 76-81 (as "78-85") 82 (unpaged) 83 (as "84") 84 (unpaged) 85-110 109bis-110bis 111-112 111bis-112bis 113-118 117bis-118bis 119-120 119bis-120bis 121-181 182 183-184.

The present collation differs in some degree from earlier ones given by Stevenson (1961, no. 673) and MacPhail (1963, p. 33). In conformity with MacPhail’s practice, inferred numerical signatures are here preferred to letters, but since the whole work is unsigned the use of “π-8π” for the first 8 leaves is not adopted. The fascicle titles are not included in the collation proper. The use of plate numbers as inserted signatures, as might be suggested, is not practicable for Stirpes novae because quite a number of species are treated which are not illustrated.

It must be stressed again, as was done by Stevenson, that the format is broadsheet (the original sheet unfolded), easily identified by the two pinholes (stab-holes, fde Stevenson) in the lateral margins, and not folio, as reported in practically all other sources (MacPhail excepted).

Bibliographically remarkable is the anomalous pagination of leaves 46-50 (pp. 75-84) [fascicle 3], and the inclusion of four leaves with bis-pagination
STIRPES NOVAE,
AUT MINUS COGNITÆ,
QUAS
DESCRIPTIONIBUS ET ICONIBUS
ILLUSTRAVIT
Carolus-Ludovicus L'HERITIER, Dom. DE BRUTELLE,
in Aula Juvanimun Parisensi, Regis Consiliarius.

PARISIIS,
EX TYPOGRAPHIA PHILIPPI-DIONYSII PIERRES,
Regis Typographi Ordinii, vni San-Jacobii.

M. DCC. LXXXIV.

Fig. 11. Title-page facsimile (reduced) of L'Héritier de Brutelle's Stirpes novae.
Hunt Botanical Library copy
corresponding to the four bis-plates, all of them in fascicle 5. The skip in pagination between ii and v (pp. iii and iv are lacking) may be either a typographical error or may refer to the title of fascicle 1 (or even to an unpublished leaf). However, no such gap was provided for the titles of fascicles 2-5. The catchword “STIRPES” on 2r (p. ii) fits with both 3r (p. v) and the first fascicle title.

A completely new element presented in this paper is the treatment of leaf 94, pp. 163-164. Stevenson and MacPhail both studied the HBL1 copy, and both reported these pages twice, the second pair as “163-164 [bis].” While it is true that pages 163-164 are twice represented in this copy, without typographical distinction, a comparison of the text of the two leaves shows that both versions, one headed Dolichos fabaeformis, the other Indigofera tetragonoloba, are nearly identical and therefore must refer to the same taxon; in other words, one of the two leaves is to be regarded as a cancellans, the other as the cancellandum which certainly the author did not want to have retained in the final book. Consequently, only one name can be validly published. But which name was the one intended to be definitely accepted?

Judging from the copy mentioned, no clear decision could be made. The contents leaf (8r, p. xv) lists the species as Dolichos fabaeformis, and so does pl. lxxviii. However, plates are sometimes prepared and printed ahead of the text, and therefore last minute name changes by the author might not have been taken into consideration in both places. Furthermore, the author expresses some taxonomic doubt when treating the taxon under Dolichos. Nevertheless, sufficient evidence was obtained in favor of Dolichos fabaeformis for it to be the name that L’Héritier finally accepted. He refers to the taxon in a letter to Jonas Dryander (1748-1819), curator of the Banks collection in London, dated December 29, 1788 (BM(NH) Banksian Ms. No. 101: no. 27), as Indigofera tetragonoloba “Stirp. pag. 163. t. 78,” not mentioning Dolichos fabaeformis. Since the fascicle in which pp. 163-164 and pl. lxxviii are included (fascicle 6) was published in September 1791, a change of opinion from Indigofera to Dolichos is easily understandable; not, however, the reverse change, because during an interval of nearly three years the contents leaf and plate inscription could undoubtedly have been corrected. From a letter by L’Héritier published in the supplement to the Journal de Paris no. 63, 4 March 1789, it is known that this sixth fascicle had been printed by that time; on the other hand, in a letter to Sir James Edward Smith (1759-1828), dated 24 May 1790 (Linn. Smith Ms. 5: 122r), L’Héritier admits that the fascicle has not yet been published, since he still wants to check one or two items. Although only Indigofera argentea (Stirp. nov. pp. 165-166, pl. lxxix) is mentioned, the delay might have been caused
likewise by newly elaborating the affinities and taxonomic position of *Indigofera tetragonoloba* versus *Dolichos fabaeformis*.

The final proof as to which of the two leaves is the one lastly accepted by L'Héritier resulted from detecting the incomplete erasure of the inscription on pl. lxxix *Indigofera tetragonoloba* in certain copies to have been overprinted by *Dolichos fabaeformis*, but leaving still the *Indigofera* binomial faintly visible. To explain the fact that the earlier text version was retained, as in the HBL copy and also in the K (copy i), Lindl. (copy B), MICH, MoSB (copy 2) Teyler, and W copies, it is noted that neither leaf is signed or bears an indication; therefore the printer who apparently was responsible for eliminating the cancelled leaf may easily have overlooked this one. While in the majority of copies only the *cancellans* +94 *Dolichos fabaeformis* is present, copy i of P-BC is the single one known to me to include only the *cancellandum*, —94 *Indigofera tetragonoloba*. This very copy is also remarkable in other respects: pl. lxxix is signed *Indigofera tetragonoloba* likewise, and leaf 8, pp. xv-xvi (the contents leaf), is lacking as is also leaf 104, pp. 183-184 (the conspectus of fascicle 7). Fascicle 6 of this copy therefore represents a prepublication state, since all other copies seen include leaves 8 and +94 (leaf 104 is missing also in some other copies, see below). Lamarck (1789, p. vi) cites five species treated in the sixth fascicle of *Stirpes novae*, among them *Indigofera tetragonoloba*, p. 163, pl. lxxix. This clearly indicates that Lamarck had access to a prepublication copy; perhaps this was the P-BC copy, since he was a professor at the Jardin du Roi in Paris which later became the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle. Another prepublication copy that had been in the possession of Sir Joseph Banks (1743-1820) in London is cited by Stafleu in *Taxon* 12: 69-70. 1963. Presumably this was the same copy seen by Franz Freiherr von Jacquin (1766-1838), according to a letter published by Kronfeld (1921, p. 172). However, this copy is not identical with Bank's copy now at the British Museum.

According to the *International code of botanical nomenclature* (1961) and hereafter designated as *ICBN*, only the binomial *Dolichos fabaeformis* L'Hérit. is validly published; not, however, *Indigofera tetragonoloba* (L.) L'Hérit. Both names are based on *Psoralea tetragonoloba* Linnaeus, *Mantissa* 104. 1567. The combination *Dolichos tetragonolobus* (L.) L'Hérit. was not available, since this binomial had been preused by Linnaeus, *Systema naturae* ed. 10. 2: 1162. 1759, for a different species, and therefore a new epithet was required.
3. Contents

The generic names Aristotelia (Tiliaceae; p. 31), Didelta (Compositae; p. 53) and Plectranthus (Labiateae; p. 84 [unpaged, verso of leaf 50, the recto of which is erroneously paged “84”]) are conserved, while Dombeya (Bignoniaceae; p. 33) has been rejected in favor of the later homonym Dombeya Cav. (Sterculiaceae) and the later homotypic synonym Tourettia Fougereau corr. Schreb. (Bignoniaceae), cf. ICBN 1961, p. 283 (no. 4927), p. 284 (no. 5053), p. 304 (no. 7350), p. 307 (no. 7766), and p. 321 (no. 9430). The names of the new taxa or the new names proposed on 104th, pp. 183-184 (conspicet of fascicle 7), are validly published. However, it should be mentioned that some names published in Stirpes novae, especially in the sixth fascicle including the conspectus, were published earlier by Lamarck, in Encyclopédie méthodique. Botanique 3 (1783-1792), and by Aiton, in Hortus kewensis (1789).

Included in fascicle 6 is the reprint of L’Héritié’s earlier work Louichaei (published in December, 1787) as pp. 135-136 (and pl. lxv). Significantly, the specific name of the earlier publication, Louichea cervina L’Hérét. (Caryophyllaceae), is changed to L. pteranthus (L.) L’Hérét., due to the author’s new identification of Louichea with the genus Pteranthus Forskål (1775, p. 36) and the species P. dichotomus Forsk. based on Camphorosma pteranthus Linnaeus, Mantissa 41. 1767, thus rendering L’Héritié’s new combination illegitimate.

4. Paper

Two different states in size and kind of the letterpress are easily recognizable: the “normal” size, about 370 × 540 mm, laid, with chain lines horizontal (format 11)!, and the large paper size, about 445 × 600 mm, wove. For both sizes unmarked paper has been used, and no conventional sheet names can be attributed to them. Of the 31 copies for which I have notes, 20 are of the smaller size, eleven of the larger one; Vesque (1883, no. 816) mentions
another copy of this larger size. Both sizes vary within rather narrow
limits, as is revealed by the examination of uncut copies. Since the edges of
handmade paper are not straight, all measurements are somewhat inaccura-
te. Each of the three copies at the Lindley Library bear identifications
of A, B, C. Of the two copies at the Linnean Society, copy 1 has plates
colored and copy 2 has plates uncolored. Copies of “normal” size have the
following dimensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K (copy 1)</td>
<td>360×530 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-BC (copy 1)</td>
<td>360×540 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBL</td>
<td>368×540 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>370×532 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindl (copy C)</td>
<td>370×533 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>370×532 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies of the “larger” size have the following dimensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>440×600 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN (copy 1)</td>
<td>445×600 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-BC (copy 2)</td>
<td>445×600 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Dates of publication

Six fascicles of letterpress were published from 1783 to 1791, all of them were
accompanied by plates and were provided with fascicle titles (dated 1784
or 1785).

- Fasc. 3: 5, 29-39; ix-x, 41-62: March-April 1786.
- Fasc. 4: 6, 40-59; xi-xii, 63-102: March 1788.
- Fasc. 5: 7, 60-79; xiii-xiv, 103-154: January 1789.
- Fasc. 6: 8, 80-104; xv-xvi, 155-184: September 1791.

The conspectus of the seventh fascicle, 104th, pp. 183-184, was given out
together with the sixth fascicle. This is shown by the FR copy where
fascicles 1-5 are on laid paper, uncut, and fascicle 6, including the con-
spectus, on wove paper which has been cut from the large paper size to
fit with the size of the other fascicles. It should be noted, however, that
seven of the 28 complete copies studied lack this final leaf (HBL, K [copy 1],
Lindl. [copy C], MB-S, MICH, MoSB [copy 2], P-BC [copy 1; prepublishing
copy, see above]). Fascicle titles are missing in five copies (E: fascicles 2, 4;
HBL: 3, 4, 6; Lindl. [copy B]: 1, 5, 6; Lindl. [copy C], Teyler: all fascicle
titles). Of the 44 copies known, nine are incomplete in various degrees,
lacking at least one complete fascicle (BM [copy 2] fascicles 1-5 only present;
BN [copy 2]: 1 only; BN [copy 3]: 1, 3, 5 only; Bod.: 1-5 only; E-U: 1-5 only;
MBHo: 1-4 only; Plesch: 1-5 only; CtY and NN: incomplete, fascicles
present not known). It is likely that the turbulent affairs of the French
Revolution, which largely prevented active communication, are mainly
responsible for the large number of incomplete copies reported.
6. Variants

Stirpes nova, illustratae iconibus P. tri J. phi Redouté. Paris, s.d. [after 1800?]. Two part titles only.

Transcription: CAR. LUD. L’HERITIER, | DOM. DE BRUTELLE, IN AULA JUVAMINUM PARISIENSIS, REGIS CONSILIARII, | STIRPES NOVAE, | ILLUSTRATAE ICONIBUS | P. TRI J. PHI REDOUTÉ. | VOLUMINIS PRIMI | PARS PRIMA. [part 2: PARS SECUNDA.] | PARISIIS | SUMPTIBUS JOANNIS BAPTISTAE GARNERY. | Typis Ph. DION. PIERRES.

Stirpes nova, illustratae iconibus a P. tri J. phi Redouté. Paris, s.d. [after 1800?]. One part title only.

Transcription: CAR. LUD. L’HERITIER, | DOM DE BRUTELLE, IN AULA JUVAMINUM PARISIENSIS, REGIS CONSILIARII, | STIRPES NOVAE, | ILLUSTRATAE ICONIBUS | A P. TRI J. PHI REDOUTÉ. | VOLUMINIS PRIMI | PARS PRIMA. | PARISIIS. | SUMPTIBUS JOAN. BAPT. GARNERY. | Typis Ph. DION. PIERRES.

These part titles are extremely rare, only five being known, four of them in different copies: part 1: BM(NH), Teyler; part 2: Lindl. [copy A, copy B], Teyler. K [copy 2] has a handwritten part title for part 1 which might constitute a replacement for a damaged printed leaf. Remarkably, even the two paper sizes are represented among these part titles. The titles of part 1 differ slightly (cf. the two transcriptions); the first version refers to the BM(NH) copy, and the second to the Teyler copy.

The main distinguishing characters between the part titles and the title-page or the fascicle titles are: (1) they are undated; (2) a volume number (vol. 1) is given; (3) the title is changed, attributing all the illustrations to P.-J. Redouté; and (4) J.-B. Garnery is cited as publisher. No information is available on the distribution of these part titles. Three copies (including the K copy) are also accompanied by the additional plates not published during L’Héritier’s lifetime, while the Lindl. [copy B] and Teyler copies do not have those plates. The Teyler copy, apart from having part titles (part 1 intended for fascicles 1-4, part 2 for fascicles 5-6) is remarkable since it lacks the title-page. However, the evidence shown by this one copy is not sufficient to consider such a copy to be an issue. To attribute the date 1783 to part 1, as Ekama does, is of course out of consideration. Since the publisher J.-B. Garnery is the same Paris bookseller who bought, after L’Héritier’s death in 1800, all his manuscripts and unpublished printed material as well as his herbarium, the two part titles are likely to have been printed after 1800 (perhaps before 1809, since the printer P.-D. Pierres died
in 1808) and distributed with either complete (or incomplete?) copies of Stirpes novae still in stock or with the hitherto unpublished plates LXXXV-CXXIV (see p. 44, under Plates). A parallel is—and this makes the suggestion mentioned even more probable—that in 1813 Garnery published a second issue of L'Héritier's Geraniologia [only known copy: BM(NH)], the first issue having been published by L'Héritier himself in April 1792.

That Stirpes novae was originally planned beyond the seventh and eighth to ninth fascicles, and intended to comprise a tenth fascicle and even a second volume, is evident from a published letter by L'Héritier (Mag. Bot. [Römer & Usteri] 3: 74. 1790) and from citations of plate or page numbers contained in letters by L'Héritier written to Dryander, preserved at BM(NH) [Banksian MSS. No. 101]. They are dated Paris, 22 June 1788 (no. 8), 18 August (13), 8 September (16), 11 September (17), 6 November (24), 19 December (26), 29 December (27), 29 January 1789 (28), 8 February (29), 12 February (30), 16 February (31), 8 March (32), 12 March (33), 30 March (35), and 17 May 1789 (40). Apparently Garnery, who had given A.-P. De Candolle (1778-1841) the manuscripts he had bought from L'Héritier's heirs together with the herbarium, hoped that De Candolle would prepare the second volume of Stirpes novae for the press, and therefore the volume number 1 on the part title is quite logical. However, neither the text for fascicles 7 to 10 of vol. 1, nor that for vol. 2 was ever published, and thus L'Héritier's main work for which he had spent a large amount of both money and time remained unfinished.

PLATES

1. Collation

Regular plates, issued together with letterpress:

I-VII VIII-XXX XXXII-XXXI-LII LIII LIIIbis LIV-LVI LVIbis LVII LVIII- LIX LX-LXXXVII ±LXXVIII LXXIX ±LXXX LXXXI-LXXXIV.

Ninety-one uncolored, or colorprinted and handcolored, copper engravings of plants within a frame are present. Each illustrates a plant or characteristic parts in natural size, mostly with additional dissections of flower parts assembled at bottom, and has the parts numbered with arabic numerals. Plate numbers are at the top center of frame, botanical names (binomials) at foot center, e.g., "Piectranthus fruticosus." (pl. xli); the
The artist’s name is at left foot, the engraver’s name at right foot of frame, e.g. “P. J. Redouté del.”, “Maleuvre sculp.” (pl. xii). The plates are unfolded, with the exception of pls. lxxxi and lxxxiv which are normally folded or inserted as double plates. Plate marks measure $400 \times 275$ mm (pl. 1) to $399 \times 540$ mm (pl. lxxxi, foldout or double plate). The b-plates represent additional illustrations of species figured, bis-plates refer to the respective bis text leaves. Plates are intended to face descriptions, but in several copies they are bound at the end of the text, rarely they are at the end of each fascicle. Plates are indexed by Stapf, Index londinensis (pls. xx and lxxviii excepted). Of the 88 species figured, 67 are depicted for the first time, and for 19 species no evidence of subsequent illustration has been found. The names of plates, together with modern equivalents, and identities of artists, were reported by Stevenson (1961, pp. 441-444). The names as cited by him are given below.

1 Monetia barleroides [=Azima tetracantha]

L. Freret del.

Juillet sculp.

2 Ribes prostratum

L. Freret del.

Milsan sculp.

3 Gomphrena [=Froelichia interrupta]

Premot del.

Juillet sculp.

4 Spilanthes alba

L. Freret del.

Juillet sculp.

5 Senecio reclinatus [=paniculatus]

Fassier del.

Juillet sculp.

6 Osteosperumum [=Garruleum viscosum =] pinnatifidum*

L. Freret del.

Milsan Sculp.

7 Aristolochia Siphoidmacrophylla

Lamark 1783

L. Freret del.

Milsan Sculp.

7b idem

L. Freret del.

Juillet Sculp.

8 Cupressus pendula [=lusitanica Miller 1768]

L. Freret del.

Milsan Sculp.

9 Croton hirtus [=glandulosus Linnaeus 1758]

L. Freret del.

Milsan Sculp.

10 Brucea ferruginea

Fassier del.

Milsan Sculp.

11 Verbena triphylla [=].

L. Freret del.

Milsan Sculp.

12 V. globiflora [= . . . ]

L. Freret del.

Milsan Sculp.

13 Statice mucronata

L. Freret del.

Milsan Sculp.

14 Atriplex spinosa

L. Freret del.

Milsan Sculp.

15 Arenaria balearica

L. Freret del.

Milsan Sculp.

16 Aristolochia Macqui

P. J. Redouté del.

Fr. Hébert Sculp.

17 Dombeya [=Tourretia] lappacea

Fassier del.

P. Baquoy Sculp.

18 Andrëala cheiranthifolia

P. J. Redouté del.

Milsan sculp.

19 Siegesbeckia floscusa

P. J. Redouté del.

Milsan Sculp.

20 Parletaria [=Gesnouinia] arborea

L. Freret del.

Juillet Sculp.

21 Salsia formosa [=leuconoides]

Fassier del.

Maleuvre sculp.

22 Physalis prostrata

P. J. Redouté del.

J. J. Le Vean sculp.

23 Ehrertia halimifolia [= (IK) Grabowskia boechavaricosa Schlectendal 1832 =G. halimifolia*]

L. Freret del.

Milsan sculp.

24 E. internodis [= (IK) petiolaris Lamark 1783]

Jassigny del.

Juillet sculp.

25 Celastrus lucidus

L. Freret del.

Juillet sculp.

* = species names suggested in accordance with the international taxonomic rules concerning priorities. 
IK = Index kevenii.
Stachys cinerata
27 Malva scaparia [= Sida . . .]
28 Didelta tetragonaeolia* [= carnosa
Aiton 1789]
29 Zoega Leptaurea
30 Flacourtia Ramontchi [= indica (N.
Barrett 1768) Merrill]
30* idem
31 Allionia incarnata
32 Asperula [= Petoria] calabrica
33 Convolutus Hermanniae
34 Cestrum laurifolium
35 C. auriculatum
36 C. Parqui
37 Illecebrum [= Telanthera] frutescens
38 Zanthorrhiza apiifolia [= simplicissima
Marshall 1783]
39 Tetragonia crystallina
40 Teucrium betonicum
41 Plecanthus fruticosus
42 P. punctatus
43 Ocimum grandiflorum [= filamentosum]
[44 Cheiranthus quadrangulus [= Syrenia
sesilliflora Ledebour 1784 =
quadrangula* Kuntze 1887]
45 Buphthalmum [= Heliospis
helianthoides
46 Begonia obliqua [= nitida Dryander 1789]
47 B. erinacea
48 B. nana
49 Hibiscus Solandra
50 Malope parvisepala [= Palaua
maulvaefolia]
51 Sida trinervata [= arguta]
52 S. angustifolia
52bis S. supina
53 S. fragrans [= Bastardia . . .]
53bis S. [= Bastardia] viscosa
54 S. suberosa [= cordifolia Linnaeus]
55 S. ricinoides
56 S. jatrophiodes
56bis S. unilocularis [= veronicaeafolia
Lamarck]
57 S. pterosperma [= Cristaria multifida
Canvilles 1799 = pterosperma*]
57bis S. [Gaya] nutans*
58 S. hernandioideae [= Wissadula rostrata
Plancho 1849 = hernandioideae*]
59 S. [= Wissadula] nudiflora
59bis idem
60 S. cassinifolia [= Abutilion Jacquinii Don]
61 S. cistifolium [= Abutilion mollissimum
Sweet 1827]
62 S. mauritianum [Jacquin = Abutilion
Avicennae Geertner]
63 S. [= Abutilion] arboreum
64 S. retronsera [= Abutilion reflexum
Sweet = retractosa*]
Copies with three different states of plates are known: black and white, colored, and both plain and colored (double set of plates). The Plesch copy (consisting of fascicles 1-5, with 71 plates) is the only example reported where fascicles with colored and plain plates are mixed. Plate $\text{xxx}_{3}$β is not known in the colored state; in copies with colored plates it is either missing (HBL, K [copy 1], Lindl. [copy C], MoSB [copy 2]) or represented in black and white (BM(NH), DA); in copies with two sets of plates this plate is only present in black and white (BN [copy 1], Lindl. [copy B], Linn. [copy 1], P-BC [copy 2], Teyler). The folded (or double) plates $\text{lxxx}_{1}$ and $\text{lxxx}_{4}$ are colored only in copies with both sets of plates; in copies with colored plates these two are usually represented in black and white (BM(NH), DA, K [copy 1], Lindl. [copy C], MoSB [copy 2]), rarely (HBL) they are lacking.

Differences between plates and text: Pl. $\text{lxx}_{3}$ is signed Stuarta Malacodendron, the text on p. 153 reads S. Malachodendron.

Plates $\text{lxxviii}$ and $\text{lxxx}$ are known to occur with two different binomials. Plate $\text{lxxviii}$ was originally signed Indigofera tetragonoloba, but later this name was changed by L’Hèritier to Dolichos fabaeformis, and in conformity with the
text, where leaf 94, pp. 163-164, was cancelled and replaced by a new version (see above p. 32), the inscription of pl. lxxviii was altered to Dolichos fabaeformis. The original plate—lxxviii is represented only in two copies: apart from the prepublication copy at P-BC [copy 1] already mentioned (p. 33), it is retained in MoSB [copy 1]; both examples are in black and white. To save money, the inscription Indigofera tetragonoloba was erased in the sheets of pl. lxxviii printed in black and white and overprinted by Dolichos fabaeformis. However, in quite a few copies the original Indigofera binomial is still faintly visible (BN [copy 1], G, Lindl. [copy B], Linn. [copy 1], MiU, P-BC [copy 2], Teyler). No such erasing or overprinting is known in colored examples of pl. lxxviii; all are clearly printed as Dolichos fabaeformis, and apparently no Indigofera tetragonoloba example has ever existed in the colored state. The CGE, Linn. [copy 2], M, MB-S, MICH and U copies, which are in black and white, have pl. lxxviii with the printed inscription Dolichos fabaeformis without any indication of erasure; they are also differing in other aspects and will be treated more fully under Paper (p. 34).

A similar situation exists with regard to pl. lxxx. However, here the differences are not caused by textual changes but apparently by an error on the part of the engraver (François Hubert). With the exception of four copies just mentioned (M, MB-S, MICH, U), pl. lxxx if printed in black and white is signed Astragalus depressus P. while the text (p. 167) correctly reads A. deflexus Pall. In the second P-BC copy, the name A. depressus is accordingly hand-corrected in ink to A. deflexus. All colored examples of pl. lxxx seen are correctly signed Astragalus deflexus P. and therefore represent the cancellans pl. +lxxx. It is unknown whether colored examples of pl. —lxxx Astragalus depressus were ever printed and published.

Additional plates, issued without letterpress:

LXXXV-CVII CIX-CXXIV (CXVII as “CVII”).

Thirty-nine uncolored or rarely colorprinted and handcolored copper engravings of plants within a frame are present (pl. cvii has no frame). Each has the same features reported above under Regular plates (p. 37). Plate numbers 84bis, 85bis, 86bis, and 87bis mentioned in the conspectus of fascicle 7 on p. 183 were not adopted. Pl. cviii was not executed. The plates are unfolded, with the exception of pl. cvii which is usually folded. Plate marks measure 400×274 mm (pl. cvi) to 543×400 mm (pl. cvii, foldout). The names are not indexed by Stapf, Index Londinensis, but are cited by Pritzel, Iconum botanicarum index ed. 2, pars 2, 1866. For a list of binomials see Stearn, W. T., in Sitwell, S., and Madol, R., Album de Redouté, p. 17, 1954. Plate num-
bers and sometimes plant names do not correspond with the text of the conspectus on pp. 183-184. Also, since discrepancies with regard to these plates occur in two letters written by L'Héritier to Dryander, dated 19 December 1788 (no. 26) and 29 December 1788 (no. 27), a synopsis of plant names and plate numbers is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant name used in letter (L) and/or conspectus (C)</th>
<th>Plate no. letter</th>
<th>Plate no. consp.</th>
<th>Final plate no.</th>
<th>Divergent plant name used on plate (P) or in consp. (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spartium nubigena (C)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>84bis</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartium virgatum (C)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartium cytotoides (C)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>85bis</td>
<td>....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartium patens (L, C)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartium foliosum (L)</td>
<td>87 (see: alt. 90)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartium divaricatum (L)</td>
<td>88 (see: alt. 91)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartium umbellatum (C)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>86bis</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartium multiflorum (L, C)</td>
<td>89 [alt.: 87]</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>S. album (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartium heterophyllum (C)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>87bis</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>S. ferox (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genista triquetra (L, C)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genista pedunculata (L, C)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genista linifolia (C)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytisus foliosus (L)</td>
<td>[alt. 90]</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>C. foliolosus (C, P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytisus divaricatus (L, C)</td>
<td>[alt. 91]</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytisus biflorus (L, C)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytisus sericeus (L)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>C. proliferus (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytisus anagyrius (C)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytisus triflorus (C)</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The identity of the four names shown above in the righthand column is either obvious (Cytisus foliosus—C. foliolosus) or is revealed by a study of the prologue. Moreover, in the BM(NH) copy the names Spartium multiflorum and S. album are marked to refer to the same taxon, while Hamy (1905, p. xcvi) confirms Spartium heterophyllum and S. ferox to be identical. The synopsis shows that three species mentioned in the conspectus (two of them also in the letters), viz. Spartium cistosides, Cytisus divaricatus (alias Spartium divaricatum), and Cytisus proliferus (alias C. sericeus) have not been illustrated subsequently. The plate numbers marked as [alt.] above are given by L’Héritier as alternatives in the same letter (no. 26), in two cases under another generic name (Spartium→Cytisus), while in letter no. 27 only the possibility of a transfer from Spartium to Cytisus is mentioned. Two of the three alternative plate numbers have been adopted by L’Héritier in the conspectus (p. 183) as well as both transfers.

The name Cissus biternata L’Hér. on pl. cxxi being accompanied by an illustration with analyses showing essential characters, is validly published according to Art. 44 ICBN if the additional plates are accepted as effectually published (see below). All other plant names have been published earlier by other authors. Pls. cxvi-cxvii and cxviii-cxix are reprinted from L’Héritier’s earlier works Michauxia (published before 29 July 1788) and Virgilia (also published before 29 July 1788). In addition to the new plate number in roman numerals the old plate numbers 1 or 2 respectively have been kept; apparently the original copper plates were still available. In a list enumerating the plates planned by L’Héritier to be included in vol. 2 of Stirpes novae, published by Britten and Woodward (1905), Virgilia helioides is included as pls. 20 and 21. This is another proof as to how tentative were L’Héritier’s opinions expressed in his letters to Dryander, since Virgilia finally was definitely included among the plates of vol. 1. Plate cxx, Tricratmus admirabilis, is reprinted from the plate in L’Héritier’s supposedly unpublished work Tricratmus; only the plate of this monograph is known, in a copy preserved at the Conservatoire de botanique at Geneva. Willdenow (1798, 1(2): 807), however, who attributes both the generic name Tricratmus and the specific name T. admirabilis to L’Héritier has definitely seen a copy of this monograph, together with copies of L’Héritier’s other monographs, Louichea excepted, but including Oxybaphus which is also considered to be an unpublished work, for he includes these publications in his edition of Species plantarum, (vol. 1 (i): XXIV. 1797) under “Auctores in hac editione citati.”

The additional plates are known to be represented in only a few copies: BM(NH), BN [copy 3], CGE, HBL [incomplete copy with 27 plates], K [copy 2], Lindl. [copy A], Linn. [copy 2], P-BC [copy 2]. Pritzel (1866, pars 2,
p. xi) mentions another copy in the library of Moretti. According to the systematic catalogue (botany, vol. 6(1): 33) the former Preussische Staatsbibliothek, in Berlin, possessed a copy of pls. lxxxv-cxxiv; this copy formerly had been owned by Robert Brown (1773-1858). Its present location is unknown; at least it is not among the holdings of the Staatsbibliothek der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, in Marburg, where the systematic catalogue is preserved. Apparently this is the same copy that originally was in the possession of Sir Joseph Banks (1743-1820). In a Mss. at the British Museum of the inventory of the books of the Banks library, the entry “L'Héritier, Icones ineditae, no title, F°.” is followed by the notation “Ret[aine]d by Mr B[rown]”. (cf. vol. 1: p. 117).

These additional plates are generally in black and white, but in the HBL and W copies they are all colored, and the K copy cited has 14 of them in color, 15 in black and white, and 10 in both states. In the BM(NH) copy, pl. xcvi is also in both states. Often these additional plates are bound separately. In the K copy 2 these plates are cut out of their original paper (about the size of the plate mark) and pasted to leaves which have been trimmed to the same size as the original plates. The BM(NH) copy has in addition several unnumbered proofs of these plates, furthermore, proofs of pls. 125-167, numbered in pencil, which are not known to have been printed at all—among them only four examples which are listed by Britten and Woodward (1905) as having been planned by L'Héritier to be included in vol. 2 of Stirpes novae—, as well as a loose unpublished printed plate of Ceanothus hypericoides. [This name is cited by A.-P. De Candolle (1825, p. 32) as a synonym of species no. 28 Ceanothus microphyllus Michx., with the reference “L'Hérit. mss.”, but not mentioning this plate]. At the Conservatoire de botanique, Geneva, there are 27 (not 28, as cited by Pritzel ed. 2. no. 5268) proofs of plates preserved, most of them illustrating plants which are also represented among the additional plates (for a list of names, see Hamy 1905, p. xcvi).

To regard the additional plates as proofs, as has been suggested (e.g., MacPhail 1963, p. 36), seems unwarranted, especially since colored examples are known. Moreover, these plates are known in two paper sizes, one of them the large wove paper also used for the letterpress and the regular plates (cf. p. 34 under Paper). Both, this combination of large paper and hand colored plates, are far too expensive just to be used as proofs. We definitely know that L'Héritier intended to publish these plates, together with the appropriate text, although we have no information when they actually were printed; since fascicle 6 has been printed early in 1789, it may have been done at any time after that date. Opinions differ, however,
whether these plates are to be considered as "unpublished" or "inedited," as they are usually referred to, or as effectively published. Britten and Woodward (1905, p. 269) state that L'Héritier distributed these plates to correspondents. This may be true, and in the case of the BM(NH) copy, said by these authors to include the set of plates sent to Banks, it is unlikely, since the part title which is present does not support this conclusion. But even if the additional plates in all the copies known today would turn out to have been sent out by L'Héritier as a kind of preprint, not intended to constitute effective publication (since he still waited for the text), there is evidence that after L'Héritier's death in 1800 these plates became available to the general public. Brunet (vol. 3, p. 1043) reports that these plates were included in copies sold by the Paris bookseller G. Debure, and Stafleu, in Sertum anglicum (1963) states: "Plates bearing higher numbers [exceeding pl. lxxxiv] or no numbers at all, found in some copies, stem from the August 1805 sale by Debure and Merigot of the unpublished plates from L'Héritier's estate [p. xli]" (notes in [ ]s added by me). G. Debure is the author of the book Catalogue des livres de la bibliothèque de feu C. L. L'Héritier de Brütelle, Paris, 1802; ed. 2. anonymous, Paris, 1805; J.-G. Mérigot is the Paris bookdealer who bought L'Héritier's library in May 1802, but found no purchaser who was willing or financially able to acquire it as a whole, and therefore sold them at auction in August and September, 1805. It should be noted, however, that in Debure's published catalogue of L'Héritier's library, where, under lots nos. 910 and 912, two copies of Stirpes novae are included, the additional plates are not explicitly mentioned (no plate numbers are cited at all). It is very probable that the Paris bookseller J.-B. Garnery who had acquired L'Héritier's manuscripts and other unpublished material and who published the two part titles for Stirpes novae (see p. 36) may have distributed these plates. Since they are all on wove paper, they have perhaps been printed much later from the original copper plates; presumably, P.-J. Redouté (1759-1840) was instrumental in getting the plates printed and published. However that may be, we certainly must accept them as effectively published in accordance with Art. 29 ICBN 1961, and even the bibliographical requirement for an accepted publication, that it is put on sale to the general public, is to be considered as having been fulfilled in this case.
2. ILLUSTRATORS

Artists:

AUBRIET, Claude (b. 1651 or 1665, d. 1724 or 1743), French artist, *Peinture du roï pour la miniature*, accompanied Joseph Pitton de Tournefort (1656-1708) on his voyage to the Orient, and illustrated the works by Tournefort and Vaillant. Various plates painted by him are preserved at BN, one of these (pl. xxxiv) is reproduced in *Stirpes novae*. Biogr.: Balteau, J.: "Aubriet (Claude)." *Dict. Biogr. Franc.* 4: 258-259. 1848.


Fossier, L., French artist: four plates (pls. v, x, xvi, xx).

FRERET, Louis, French artist: 26 plates (pls. 1-11, iv, vii-vii, viii-viii, ix-xi, xii-xiv, xvi, xxx, xxxi-xl, lvi, lx, lxi-lxii, lxx, lxxv, lxxxvii, xcii; pls. xlvi and following to pl. lxxviii signed "Lud. Freret," pl. cxt "Frairet").

Jossigny, P., French artist: two plates (pls. xxiv, xxxb).

PRÉVOST, Benoît-Louis (1747-1804 or 1809), French artist: one plate (pl. iii).

REDOUTÉ, Henri-Joseph (1766-1846 or 1852), Belgian artist living in Paris, younger brother of P.-J. Redouté, member of the *Institut d'Égypte*: one plate (pl. xciv, signed "Redouté J.")


Engravers:

ALIX, François (1733-1794): one plate (pl. xcviii, signed "Alix").

BAQUOY, Pierre-Charles (1759-1829): one plate.

BARON, Claude (1758-1836): three plates.

BOUTELOU, Louis-Alexandre (1761-1840): one plate (pl. xxxvi, signed "Lud. Boutelou")


DEVISSE, Jean-Baptiste: one plate.

GODEFROY, François (1745-1819): one plate.

GUYARD, Jean-Baptiste: nine plates (pls. xcix, c, ciii signed "Guyard").

HUBERT, François (1744-1809): 21 plates (pls. xcix, xcvi, xcviii signed "Hubert").


LE VEAU, Jean-Jacques (1739-1785): one plate.

LORILLARD, ——: one plate (in collaboration with Milson).


MILSAN, ——: 31 plates (and one additional plate in collaboration with Lorillard, see above).
3. Paper

Unfolded plates. As in the letterpress, the same two principal states in size and kind of the paper are represented, however, additional features also occur. The smaller paper likewise measures about $370 \times 540$ mm, is laid, and in the majority of copies the chain lines are horizontal, i.e., the format is broadsheet. The variations in the two uncut copies seen are: length $532$ mm (FR), $540$ mm (P-BC [copy 1]); width $360$ mm (P-BC [copy 1]), $370$ mm (FR). In seven copies there occur also plates with vertical chain lines. In the M, MB-S, and U copies exclusively, in the CGE, Linn. [copy 2] and MICH copies predominantly, and in the Lindl. [copy 1] copy they are in about an even number compared to those with horizontal chain lines. The conclusion is that occasionally folio half-sheets of a considerably larger original size have been used for the unfolded plates, but only in the CGE, Linn. [copy 2], M, MB-S, MICH, and U copies is it proven that the paper used is the same as that for the folded plates. The smaller laid paper has been used for plates in black and white and sometimes also for colored plates (DA, Lindl. [copy C]) but never occurs in copies which have both sets of plates. The larger paper measures about $445 \times 600$ mm and is wove, again in accordance with the letterpress; the only uncut copy seen is that at P-BC [copy 2]. This paper was used for black and white plates and for copies with both sets of plates, including the additional plates lxxxv-cxxiv which are present at BN [copy 3] and P-BC [copy 2].

Four copies with colored plates are known which have the letterpress on small size, laid paper, but have the plates on wove paper of the same size. Also, the additional plates known in copies of the smaller paper size are of wove paper (in the second K copy the paper cannot be determined with certainty, for the plates are pasted on leaves of a different paper; but since the copy includes colored plates, these are very probably on wove paper). Thus eight copies with “mixed” (laid and wove) paper exist, not counting the FR copy where one fascicle is printed on a different type of paper than the rest. They are located at: BM(NH) (colored plus additional plates on wove paper), CGE (additional plates on wove paper), HBL (plus additional colored plates on wove paper), K [copy 1] (colored plates on wove paper), K [copy 2] (additional plates on wove (? paper), Lindl. [copy A] (additional plates on wove paper), Linn. [copy 2] (additional plates on wove paper),
MoSB [copy 2] (colored unfolded plates on wove paper). Since no uncut copy is known among them, it remains questionable whether the paper used originally was of the large size \((445 \times 600 \text{ mm})\) and cut to fit the letterpress, whether half-sheets of the much larger size on which the folded plates are printed was used, or even whether a special small size wove paper measuring about \(370 \times 540 \text{ mm}\) is involved. The second possibility is excluded from the second MoSB copy, since here the folded plates consist of laid paper. The E copy, on the other hand, where the letterpress and the majority of plates (all plain) is of the large, wove paper, has four plates (pls. iv, v, xli, lxvi) of a considerably smaller, laid paper with horizontal chain lines \((1^\circ)\), the size of the sheet being \(355 \times 545 \text{ mm}\) (pl. xii, uncut) and thus deviating in both dimensions from the extreme figures found in the letterpress or plates of the regular smaller size \((360-370 \times 530-540 \text{ mm})\).

**Folded (or double) plates.** With the exception of the second MoSB copy, already mentioned, the same type of paper for pls. lxxxi and lxxxiv has been used as for the unfolded plates of the same copy, i.e., either they are all on laid or wove paper. However, their size is much larger, and consequently the chain lines in the laid paper copies are vertical, since the sheet is inserted transversely. In the laid smaller paper copies the size is about \(535 \times 675 \text{ mm}\) (uncut: pl. lxxxi [P-BC, copy 1] \(675 \times 530 \text{ mm}\), partly cut: pl. lxxxiv [MiU] \(646 \times 533 \text{ mm}\)), in the wove larger paper size it is about \(600 \times 853 \text{ mm}\) and perhaps even \(630 \times 900 \text{ mm} \("\text{Grand Colombier}\)\) (uncut: pl. lxxxi [E] \(854 \times 600 \text{ mm}\); cut: pl. lxxxi [P-BC, copy 2] \(880 \times 610 \text{ mm}\)). In some copies of this size (BM [copy 1], BN [copy 1], G, Linn. [copy 1]) these plates are inserted unfolded, i.e., they are cut to the size of the letterpress and of the unfolded plates. In the small wove paper (unfolded plates colored, folded plates plain) the size is about \(530 \times 653 \text{ mm}\) (uncut: pl. lxxxi [K, copy 1] \(653 \times 530 \text{ mm}\). The size of the third foldout, pl. cvii (add. plates) in this smaller wove paper, is difficult to determine (cut: [HBL] \(565 \times 432 \text{ mm}\)) since this plate is usually cut to a size smaller than its plate-mark. However, in the large size copies (BN [copy 3], P-BC [copy 2]) pl. cvii is inserted unfolded and measures \(445 \times 600 \text{ mm}\).

**Watermarks.** Of the 31 copies examined, watermarks are in nine. In the MiU copy only the two folded plates have watermarks, while in the W copy the two foldouts and eight of the plates of fascicle 5 are marked. The M, MB-S, and MICH copies have watermarks on almost all the plates (except those of fascicle 5 in the MICH copy). In the CGE and Linn. [copy 2] copies the majority of plates are watermarked. The folded plates at MiU are marked.
“IHS” with a cross emerging from the horizontal stroke of the H and are countermarked “DFC.” The same watermarks occur very infrequently in Lindl. B copy (pls. xlvii, xlviii). The plate paper of the copies with vertical chain lines also has the “ISH” mark and cross, but their shape differs, and there is also a surrounding circle composed of an outer wavy and an inner straight circle line; the countermark is a heart surrounded by three letters “b” (left), “R” (right), and “F” (below). Both marks are present on pls. ixxi and ixxxiv, one of each on the unfolded plates. Here we find absolute proof that the paper used for all the plates of one copy has been the same, but the second MoSB copy, the CGE, Lindl. [copy A], and Linn. [copy 2] copies show that this result cannot be generalized. The eight copies cited have laid paper, while the plate paper of the W copy is wove. The few plates of this latter copy have the watermark “COURT-ALIN.” The watermarks have not been identified as to the paper mill, and they are not illustrated in Churchill (1935) or in Heawood (1950).

4. Dates of publication

Nine fascicles of plates were published from 1785 to 1805 (or later), the first six together with letterpress and provided with fascicle titles, the last three at the same time and without fascicle titles, but even so the work remained unfinished.

Fasc. 4: pls. xxxi-xlvi (18 plates): March 1788.
Fasc. 6: pls. lxv-lxxxiv (20 plates): September 1791.
Fasc. 7: pls. lxxxv-lcvi (13 plates): after August 1805.
Fasc. 8 and Fasc. 9: pls. xcvi-xcvii, cix-cxxiv (together 26 plates): after August 1805.

The exact number of plates comprising fascicles 8 and 9 is not known. However, it may be assumed that the 16 plates illustrating Solanum species (pl. xcvi-xcvii, cix-cxxiv) were intended to form one fascicle. That more than one fascicle is involved can be deducted from the higher than usual number of plates present, furthermore this conclusion is backed by a statement of Pritzel (1866, pars 2, p. xii). He, in addition, remarks that the copy in Moretti’s library at Pavia, Italy, has 40 plates signed lxxxv-cxxiv, treating 37 species. While the species figure is completely right only
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Fig 12. Fascicle title, in facsimile (reduced), fascicle 5, Stirpes novae (1789).
Hunt Botanical Library copy
39 plates are known to exist in other copies, pl. cviii not having been printed. It is certain that the wrong figure 40 (also in Hunt Cat., no. 673, and MacPhail, p. 36) indicates the range from pl. lxxxv through pl. cxxiv; for a handwritten list of the plates in the Moretti copy, placed in the MB-S copy, contains only 39 names and omits pl. cviii.

The publication date for plates lxxxv-cxxxiv forming fascicles 7 to 9 is not substantiated by reviews but the statements by Brunet and Stafileu mentioned above on p. 45 make it clear that these plates became available to the general public in August 1805, and therefore this date is here accepted. It is irrelevant whether these plates were included in complete or incomplete copies of fascicles 1-6 of Stirpes novae, whether they were given out separately as a bound or unbound unit or even distributed as loose sheets. Probably all of these three procedures did occur; evidence for the last is that the ten colored plates in K [copy 1], which are also represented by examples in black and white, were only acquired in this century as single printed leaves. As already pointed out earlier on p. 32 the distribution of plates to certain correspondents by L'Héritier during his lifetime cannot be accepted as effective publication since L'Héritier even then planned to edit also the corresponding text; these plates therefore are preprints, in the same manner as this is true for fascicle 6 in the first P-BC copy.

No information is available to me whether all three states of plates (black and white, colored, plain and colored) were represented among those copies published at the dates given above. The Hunt Botanical Library holds documents by two of the Redouté brothers, published by Lawalrée (1963), which indicate that at least a considerable part of the colored plates were executed at a remarkably later date. A document written by H.-J. Redouté shows that plates for ten copies of fascicle 4, handcolored by the two Redouté brothers, were delivered to L'Héritier on 20 August 1790 (Lawalrée, no. 181), i.e., nearly two and one-half years after this fascicle was originally published. Another document is an invoice by P.-J. Redouté, dated 18 May 1793, mentioning that two [incomplete] copies comprising 90 plates [perhaps fascicles 1-4?] were handcolored by him for L'Héritier; moreover, one Aristolochia plate [pl. xiv] belonging to the first fascicle (!) is especially listed, and there is an addition on this document, apparently in L'Héritier's hand, that P.-J. Redouté still has to color one copy with plates of fascicles 1 and 4 (Lawalrée, no. 200). Receipts on the same document by P.-J. Redouté for payments made by L'Héritier for coloring plates are even dated as late as 26 floréal (= 9 May) 1794. If one considers the fact, in addition to these data, that all colored examples of pls. lxxvii and lxxx bear the correct inscriptions (no canceled colored prints of these plates
are known) the evidence pointing to a later publication date of the colored plates becomes rather strong. The same holds for the four copies with plain plates seen, where pl. XXX is signed Astragalus deflexus (M, MB-S, MICH, and U) which at the same time are the majority of those copies where the paper of almost all the plates has watermarks. It is rather certain that the plates of these copies, and those of the few other copies cited earlier (CGE, Lindl. [copy A], Linn. [copy 1]), and which are folio half-sheets (with chain lines vertical), were printed later than those of the unmarked copies. Of course, a later printing date does not necessarily mean a later publication date, but in this case there seems to be no reason to arrive at a different conclusion.

DATA REFERRING TO BOTH LETTERPRESS AND PLATES

1. Printer

2. Publisher
The author, C.-L. L'Héritier de Brutelle. The two part titles were published by Jean-Baptiste Garnery, Paris bookseller.

3. Reviews

4. Bibliographical Studies

5. References
Atw. p. 51; Bart. 52; Br. ed. 5. 3: pp. 1043-1044; Bradley 1: p. 263; Cat. Red. 1; Danner 909; Debure 911; Decne. 174; Dunth. 146; Ebert 9473; Ekama 1(4): 186; Gr. 4: p. 191; Hew. p. 183; Heywood 42; Hunt-Carn. 49; Hunt Cat. 673; Hutch. p. 254; Jacks. p. 111; Kew 1: p. 359;
6. Location of copies

Copies studied: BM [2 copies], BM(NH), BN [3 copies], DA, E, FR, G, HBL, K [2 copies], Lindl. [3 copies], Linn. [2 copies], CGE, M, BB-S, MICH, MiU, MoSB [2 copies], P, P-BC [2 copies], Teyle, U. W.

Copies mentioned in the literature: Bod., CTY, CU, Elphistone (Lord), E-U, MBHo, MH, MH-A, Moretti, NN, NNBG, Plesch, US.

SUMMARY

As a result of the examination of 31 copies of Stirpes novae, the following new conclusions are presented:

1. Leaf 94 (pp. 163-164) titled Dolichos fabaeformis and pl. lxxviii with the same inscription represent cancellantia substituted for the earlier version Indigofera tetragonoloba. Only the name Dolichos fabaeformis L'Herit. is validly published.

2. Plate lxxx in the colored state (rarely in the plain state) with the inscription Astragalus deflexus P[all], represents a cancellans plate intended to replace the plate erroneously signed Astragalus depressus P[all].

3. Part titles for volume 1 parts 1 and 2 have been published, presumably after L'Heritier's death in 1806. They are very rare, only five examples being known to exist, four of them in different copies. (The earlier reference by Ekama (1886) to vol. 1 part 1 seems to have been overlooked by subsequent bibliographical authors.)

4. Plate xxx8 does not occur in the colored state; it is either lacking or replaced by a plate in black and white.

5. Plates lxxxi and lxxxiv (foldouts or double plates) are colored only in copies with two sets of plates (plain, colored), but plates in black and white are substituted for them in copies which otherwise have only colored plates.

6. The 39 [not 40!] additional plates numbered lxxxv-cvii, cix-cxxiv and forming fascicles 7-9 are to be considered as effectively published, thus the date of publication must be shifted from 1785-1791 to 1785-1805.
7. Watermarks are reported to occur occasionally on the plate paper (seen in eight copies).

8. Documents demonstrate that colored plates were finished much later than the corresponding fascicles were first published; however, the evidence available is not strong enough to generally prove that all copies with colored plates were published later than those with plain ones.

ABBREVIATIONS

Atw.—Atwood, 1908.
Bart.—Bartlett, 1948.
BM—British Museum, Bloomsbury, London.
BM(NH)—British Museum (Natural History), London.
Bod.—Bodleian Library, Oxford.
Br. ed. s.—Brunet, 1860-1878.
Bradley—Rehder, 1911-1918.
CGS—Botany School, Cambridge University.
CTY—Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.
CU—University of California, Berkeley.
DA—National Agricultural Library, U.S. Dept. of Agr., Washington, DC.
Decne.—Decaisne, 1858.
Dunth.—Dunthorne, 1938.
E—Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh.
E-U—University of Edinburgh.
FR—Senckenbergische Bibliothek, Frankfurt a. M.
G—Conservatoire de Botanique, Geneva.
Gr.—Graesse, 1839-1869.
Hew.—Hewett, 1918-1920.
Hunt-Carn.—Hunt, 1932.
Hunt Cat.—Stevenson, 1932.
Hutch.—Hutchinson, 1927.
ICBN—Lanjouw et al., 1961.
Jacks.—Jackson, 1881.
K—Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond.
Kew—Jackson, 1889-1893.
Lindl.—Lindley Library, Royal Horticultural Society, London.
Linn.—Linnear Society, London.
M—Botanische Staatsammlung, Munich.
MBHo—Massachusetts Horticultural Society, Boston, Mass.
MB-S—Staatsbibliothek der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Marburg.
MH—Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
MICH—Herbarium, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
MiU—University of Michigan, Rare Book Room, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
MoSB—Missouri Botanical Garden, St. Louis, Missouri.
M.-W.—Merrill & Walker, 1938.
Niss.—Nissen, 1931.
Plesch—Bibliothèque Arpad Plesch "La Léonina," Beaulieu-sur-Mer, A.-M.
Pr. ed. 2.—Pritzel, 1872-1877.
Fr. 1c. ed. 2.—Pritzel, 1866.
Sitwell & Blunt, 1935.
Teyle—Teyle's Stichting, Haarlem.
U—Botanisch Museum en Herbarium, Utrecht.
US—U.S. National Museum (Department of Botany), Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
W—Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna.
W.-T.—Woodward & Townsend, 1903-1940.
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