Thelymitra aff. ixioides from Waihaha, west of Taupo.
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Editorial

Back to basics: I – Jurassic park

If you are ever down in the Catlins, southeast Otago, and you travel west towards Invercargill, you will see a sign pointing to Curio Bay. It's well worth a visit – the stone stumps, fallen logs, and occasional fossil leaves of kauri-like trees petrified on the shore are relics of the Jurassic period. It began 180 million years ago – dinosaurs ruled the land, the air was loud with the harsh shrieks of pterodactyls, and the vegetation was dominated by ferns, cycads, mosses and conifers. It ended 140 million years ago with the demise of the dinosaurs, perhaps by the dust from major meteorite impact obscuring the sun, wrecking photosynthesis, and reducing plant food. Perhaps.

New Zealand’s ancestral landmass, along with early India, Australia, Africa, South America and Antarctica, had formed the great continent of Gondwana, and in Jurassic times this enjoyed a temperate climate, hospitable to the kauri, frogs, ferns, tuatara and kiwi that shared it.

At the start of the Cretaceous period, about 140 million years ago, the great landmass split, and ancestral New Zealand formed a part of West Gondwana. The first Angiosperms are thought to have evolved in the West Gondwana rainforests, and the sequence of split-up of the continent determined where families of ancient flowers were established. Lilies were formed, and later, perhaps 80-100 million years ago, the first terrestrial orchids.

The Tasman Sea opened up 60-80 million years ago, setting New Zealand adrift from Australia, along with its West Gondwana plants, among them some primitive orchids.

By the Eocene epoch (54-38 million years ago) flowering plants and insects were diversifying rapidly. In Australia they formed the unique plant-insect pollination partnerships seen today. In New Zealand few such partnerships developed, and most of our orchids adapted to self-pollination.

Later windborne seed from Malaysia and Australia made effective landfall here, sometimes accompanied by the necessary pollinating insects.

This is all semi-literate guesswork of course – no orchid fossils have been found in any parts of old Gondwana. Two plant fossils thought to be orchidaceous were found in Eocene rock in Italy – Protorchis monorchis and Palaeorchis rhizoma – and orchid fruit from the Pliocene (2.5-10 million years ago) have been found in Germany.

So where does that leave us? Ancient orchids from West Gondwana were part of our plant heritage when we broke free 60-80 million years ago, and since then more have arrived on the westerlies. A bit ho-hum really.

References
# TABLE: Geological time and the development of orchids (after Adams [1])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epoch</th>
<th>Million years ago</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td><em>Homo erectus</em> evolves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliocene</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Oldest fossils of primitive man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miocene</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Peak expansion of orchids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligocene</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Diversification of orchids, flowering plants (and associations with insect pollinators in Australia).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eocene</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Development of different forest types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleocene</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Tasman Sea separates Australia &amp; New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cretaceous</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Origin of major orchid groups (early types) - epiphytes and lithophytes. Mammals appear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cretaceous</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Origin of early terrestrial orchids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Jurassic</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Origin of lilies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### THIRD AUSTRALASIAN NATIVE ORCHID CONFERENCE AND SHOW

**at Flinders University in Adelaide 26-30 September 1996**

"It will be a tremendous event and we promise a great time for all who attend.... We are hoping to be able to present the largest and most spectacular display of native Australasian orchids ever staged; one that will be talked about for years to come".

There is a **raffle** (tickets $1) for a bound copy of WH Nicholls's original three volumes of *Orchids of Australia*. Your editor has raffle tickets, instructions for the poster display, forms for exhibitors, entry forms for the photographic competition, and conference registration information.
Back to basics: II – evolution and structure

Evolution
There have been some key evolutionary changes (Great Forward Leaps, or GFLs) that provided such a competitive edge that they guaranteed success for plants or animals that possessed them.

For instance there crawled out of some ancient lagoon a salamander-like creature that had evolved from a fish. From its two ventral and two anal fins it developed four very special limbs, each with one bone emerging from shoulder or hip, then two for rotation, then a series of small ones for complex movements, then five hinged digits for grasping.

This creature was so capable, compared with its competitors, that it would give rise to all the reptiles, birds and mammals that ever inhabited the earth. The five-digit limb would reach an advanced state as the seal’s flipper, the bat’s wing, the whale’s tail, the horse’s hoof, the pig’s trotter, the cat’s paw and the human hand.

Flowering plants similarly took GFLs, two of which were to provide such a competitive edge that they would give rise to all the orchids that inhabit the earth.

A few terms first

sepal: one part of the outer, usually greenish whorl (called the calyx) of flower parts.
petal: one part of the inner, usually showy whorl (called the corolla) of flower parts.
anther: the pollen-bearing part of the male organ, along with the supporting stalk forming stamen.
stigma: the receptive part of the female organ; along with the ovule-bearing ovary forming the carpel (stigma and ovary connected together by a style).

The GFLs
The first Great Forward Leap by the ancestral monocotyledon was the development of five concentric whorls of flower parts – three sepals outside three petals, outside six stamens, outside three carpels. Lilies retain six stamens and three joined stigmas (Fig 1).

Fig. 1. Six stamens and a triple stigma:
the lily-like cabbage tree – Cordyline

The second GFL by the ancestral orchid was the modification of most of the carpels and stamens into a single structure called the column.
Darwin illustrated this arrangement, (Fig. 2). Three sepals enclose three petals, but now the lowermost petal includes vestiges of two anthers, and is enlarged to form the labellum. The petals in turn enclose the column.

The column of NZ orchids has a single fertile anther (unstalked stamen), and two column-wings formed from staminodes (two other barren stamens).

Two of its three stigmas form a double-lobed stigma, with the third sterile and modified into a rostellum.

Sticky material on the rostellum forms the viscidium (viscid disk), often attached by a thin stalk, or stipe to the pollinia (aggregated pollen).

Just as when you lie face-down you are prone, so when you lie face up you are supine. Orchid flowers usually twist during the bud stage to be face-up – i.e. are resupinate. Those, like Prasophyllum that keep their labellum uppermost (facing down) are not called prone, but are called nonresupinate.

Just as each of your feet has a left and a right side, so each also has a dorsal (top) and ventral (sole) “side”. A shark has a dorsal fin on top. In a flower too the dorsal is above, hence the dorsal sepal is topside in resupinate orchid flowers.

A few more orchid nouns

auricle: an ear-shaped structure.
bract: a modified, usually much reduced leaf (when associated with the flower, is a floral bract).
callus: a thickened, often hardened part.
cauda: a tail (caudate = tail-like).
cilia (plural cilia): eyelash-like hair.
claw: the narrowed stalk-like base of a petal or sepal – in orchids usually of the labellum, attaching it to the column-foot.
fimbria: fringe (fimbriate = fringed).
galea: hooded part of flower – in Pterostylis the fused dorsal sepal and lateral petals.
gland: a secreting organ (not just a swelling, as it is often misused).
habit: the general appearance of a plant
inflorescence: a collection of flowering parts.
internode: the distance between nodes on an axis.
lamina: a thin flat part, usually the blade of a leaf.
nectary: a gland secreting nectar.
node: a place on a stem marked by the attachment of one or more leaves.
papilla: pimple (papillose = pimply).
pedicel: the stalk of an individual flower in a compound flower.
peduncle: the stalk of a solitary flower or the main stalk of a compound flower (pedunculate = stalked thus).

perianth: the whole flower.
petiole: the stalk of a leaf (petiolate).
placenta: the part of an ovary where the ovules are attached.
pseudobulb: the thickened part of an aerial stem, e.g. in Bulbophyllum.
raceme: an unbranched inflorescence with stalked flowers.
rhizome: an underground stem.
scale: a small leaf-like part.
spike: an unbranched inflorescence with unstalked flowers.
tepal: a sepal or petal.
tubercle: a little nodule (tuberculate = lumpy).

*Corybas macranthus* on its peduncle, showing its petiolate leaf, floral bract, caudate lateral sepals and petals, and auricle.
The flower spike of *Gastrodia cunninghamii* on its peduncle, showing scale leaves and tuberculate flowers.

The leaves of *Pterostylis brumalis* arise from nodes on the peduncle. Caudate lateral sepals rise above the galea.
A raceme of *Earina mucronata* flowers, each on its own pedicel.

Column-arms of *Thelymitra hatchii* bear cilia

Those of *T. pulchella* bear fimbria

*Prasophyllum* "aff. patens" column has its pollinia displaced but still attached by a stipe to the rostellum; the anther-cap is empty, and the two prominent column-wings can be seen as vestigial sterile stamens, or staminodes

The labellum of *Dendrobium cunninghamii* is attached by a claw to the column-foot.
Back to basics: III – abnormal structures

Ulrich Walthert, a Westland photographer, produced a calendar some years ago showing his photographs of native orchids. Among them was one of *T. hatchii* showing an extra column lobe.

Bruce Irwin wrote, after reading the paper on *Thelymitra ixioides* and *T. circumsepta* reviewed in *Australian notes* in this issue, “Actually I’m puzzled by the apparent absence of *T. formosa* from Australia. Quite a number of *T. formosa* in the North Island possess the extra column lobe of *T. circumsepta* though they seem always to retain the stronger colours of *T. formosa*. The two species must be very closely related”.

Bruce added, “I have seen extra column arms variously developed in *T. hatchii*, *T. ‘pseudopauciflora’*, *T. ‘rough leaf’*, *T. aemula*, *T. tholiformis* and *T. formosa*. Usually it is a simple triangular structure, notched in *T. aemula*, and sometimes elongated in *T. hatchii* and *T. formosa*”.

That extra arm is interesting in evolutionary terms.

One “proof” of the evolutionary origin of a structure is the occasional reversion to a more primitive form. For instance a colony of *Caladenias* in Northland was found with labella similar to the other petals and sepals – “proof” that the labellum was once just another petal. The colony was mistakenly thought to be a new genus, and was called *Petalochilus* by RS Rogers in 1924.

Jean Jenks told me several years ago that she had found in South Otago a colony of *Aporostylis bifolia* with petaloid labella.
Sketches by Bruce Irwin showing the extra column arms often found in North Island specimens of *Thelymitra formosa*. Upper: Hauhangaroa Range; lower: near summit of Hauhangatahi.
cavity embracing the lower two-thirds of the column. The staminoid appendage, which distinguishes Petalochilus is, however, absent in these Caladenia specimens. Calochilus imberbis is another example of a petaloid labellum in a genus which normally has a most complicated labellum”.

It happens to people too – the commonest “birth defect” in humans is partial “syndactyly” – part joining of the fingers or toes by skin – an incomplete reversion to a primitive flipper-like hand or foot whose digits were fused together. Curiously enough this anomaly is common among Rwandan mountain gorillas, and there it has been attributed to consanguinity as the gorilla population shrinks and the gene pool diminishes.

The primitive orchid Neuwiedia still has three fertile stamens (see figure).

In these Thelymitras (remember? we were talking about T. hatchii, T.
formosa and T. circumsepta) the front of the column appears to have elongated — suggesting that that part of the column was originally a separate structure. It was indeed separate — it was a stamen. The column-wings in many orchid species are called staminodes to indicate their origin, and, as Dan Hatch points out (see his paper which follows), a third stamen is confluent with the front of the column where it sometimes appears as a staminoid appendage.

(If you were to remove the column-arms and the anther and stigma, that staminoid appendage would make the "mitra" of the Thelymitra even more like the bishop's mitre after which it was named.)

Certainly, as Bruce Irwin pointed out, the extra arm would seem to hinder insect pollination. Oh no! Could this "birth defect" be a symptom of habitual self-pollination ("consanguinity") in these self-pollinating Thelymitras?

---

**Back to basics: 4**

- **the structure of the orchid flower in New Zealand**

by ED Hatch, a paper commissioned by the editor, and updated June 1995

This note was first published in the Newsletter of the Auckland Botanical Society in 1964 [1] and was based on Darwin's theory [2]. I have altered this version slightly and updated it.

The monandrous orchid flower is peculiar because it is adapted for cross-pollination by specific insects. There are as many flower variations as there are insect types to pollinate them. Wasps, flies, bees, ants, moths, spiders and chewing beetles are all catered for. The attraction is centred in the middle petal (labellum) and may be perfume, colour or nectar, or perhaps edible calli. Sometimes the labellum assumes the form of the insect concerned, and near-mechanical devices, traps and pitfalls are not uncommon. The pollinating mechanism of our native orchids has been largely evolved outside New Zealand and the local insect fauna is not sufficiently diverse to do it justice. Consequently there is a strong secondary tendency towards self-pollination or even cleistogamy (self-pollination within the unopened flower).

The flower of the orchid is basically liliaceous, but the relationship is often hard to trace. The ovary is inferior, i.e. below the flower; is ribbed, and opens by longitudinal slits. This is a useful point of identification. We may imagine the hypothetical orchid ancestor as having three sepals, three petals, six stamens in two whorls, and a single style with a tri-fid stigma. The fusion of four of the stamens with the already confluent styles would seem to have developed in different ways to produce different groups of orchids, but in all of them it would appear to have
preceded the specialised perianth. With the organs of reproduction in confluence, normal pollination became impossible, and the next logical step in the flower's development was the modification of the abaxial segment (in this case the middle sepal) to form a landing stage for insects. But the middle sepal, being an outer covering segment, could not lend itself to the delicate modifications which eventually took place, so the ovary became twisted through 180° to bring the middle petal (labellum) into the abaxial position, where it could be more easily adapted to the formation of nectaries and calli and the finer shades of colour and form. At the same time the middle sepal came round into the dorsal position where by reason of its heavier texture and protective nature, it could serve as an awning over the anther. The modification of the labellum was completed by its fusion with the two remaining free stamens. Most orchids begin with the flower in its original position and the ovary twists during development. In Prasophyllum, Genoplesium and Gastrodia the flower is inverted with the labellum uppermost – actually the right way up! Has the ovary in these species not twisted at all? Or has it twisted through the whole 360° and so come back to its starting point?

All the New Zealand orchids belong to the subfamily Orchidoideae, which has only one fertile anther and two fertile stigmas. The structure of such a flower may be summarised as follows.

Theoretically there are 15 segments in five whorls of three. In each whorl two of the segments are paired and the third is usually different in form or function or both.

**Whorl 1:** three styles, each capped by its stigma, confluent to form a single structure (column) in the centre of the flower. Two of the stigmas are paired and combine to form the stigmatic plate on the front of the column. The third stigma, or a portion of it, appears to be modified to form the rostellum at the top of the column.

**Whorl 2:** three stamens, two of them paired and confluent with the sides of the column to form the column-wings (very prominent in Thelymitra, where they supersede the insect-attractive function of the labellum), the third stamen confluent with the front of the column where it sometimes appears as a staminoid appendage. (Th. hatchii, circumsepta etc.)

**Whorl 3:** three stamens, two of them paired and confluent with the labellum to form the various labellar calli, the third (the only fertile stamen in the subfamily Orchidoideae) usually confluent (but not in Thelymitra) with the back of the column and carrying the two-celled anther, which overtops and usually rests on the rostellum. (In Pterostylis the two paired stamens of this whorl do not usually enter the labellum proper but appear as the ciliate processes of the labellar appendage, or sometimes produce labellar calli (Pt. irsoniana). In Thelymitra they are included in the front edges of the column-wings and finally extruded as the cilia of the secondary lobes).

**Whorl 4:** three petals, two of them
similar, the third (labellum) rarely similar (Thelymitra, Petaloehilus), usually much modified to form an attractive landing-stage for insects.

**Whorl 5:** three sepals, two of them similar, the third (dorsal) sometimes similar, usually much enlarged, its main purpose being to canopy the anther.

Most orchid genera are subject to reversion and odd ancestral features, free stamens, petaloid labella etc. may be found from time to time. Such are as a rule infertile and their peculiarities die with them. Once in a while however, these mutations do not interfere with the reproductive processes and we get forms like Petaloehilus, which become quite abundant until man interferes with the habitat. Ordinary malformations are also common. Repressed or enlarged organs, twin labella, petals etc, double or multiple flowers. These are often due to insect or fungus diseases or to purely mechanical causes.

**References**
1. Darwin C. The various contrivances by which orchids are fertilised by insects p236 (1904)

---

**Gastrodia cunninghamii** and **Gastrodia orobanchoides**

by Ian St George

Although the Index Kewensis noted in 1893 that Gastrodia cunninghamii and G. orobanchoides Mueller from the New Hebrides were identical, Lewis & Cribb (in their Orchids of Vanuatu 1989 [1]) claimed the latter as a new synonym for the former. J. Renz also mentioned a G. orobanchoides in Nasir & Ali's Flora of Pakistan, 1984 [2]. What is the history?

1847 Falconer found a Himalayan orchid that he thought looked like an Orobanche so he called it Gamoplexis orobanchoides [3].

1853 JD Hooker described Gastrodia cunninghamii [4]. William Colenso thought it looked like an Orobanche, so he wrote (in 1884), "It is leafless, and has a strange appearance, reminding one at first sight of the larger British species of Orobanche (Broom rape)" [5].

1873 the Rev. Fraser collected an orchid on the island of Eromanga (now part of Vanuatu, but then the New Hebrides) and sent it to Melbourne to Ferdinand von Mueller who thought it was a Gastrodia and looked like an Orobanche – so he called it Gastrodia orobanchoides [6]. The specimen is in the herbarium at Melbourne. Von Mueller would not have known of the Himalayan species, for it was not until ten years later, that in

1883 Bentham saw that the Himalayan plant was a Gastrodia, and it became Gastrodia orobanchoides (Falc.) Benth. [7]. A careful illustration by S. Hameed [2] (reproduced in NZNOG Journal 51: 5) shows a long column and a plant that is quite unlike G. cunninghamii. There are thus two species involved. Von Mueller’s name would have become invalid in
1883, and in any case, in
1893 *Index Kewensis* identified *G. orobanchoides sensu* von Mueller as
*G. cunninghamii*, and in
New Zealand has two *Gastrodia* with
a long column (*G. aff. sesamoides* and
*G. "long column"*), and two with a short
column (*G. cunninghamii* and *G. minor*). The only record of a *Gastrodia*
with a short column outside New
Zealand is that single specimen from
Vanuatu.
Lewis & Cribb did write, “More
information is needed on this species in
Vanuatu”, and now more information is
available. David Jones has examined
the Melbourne specimen in Canberra.
It is not a *Gastrodia* but a *Goodyera*, a
different genus entirely (D. Jones,
*personal communication*).

*Gastrodia Zeylanica* from Sri Lanka [15].
All the Australian Gastrodia (seven at last count [8]) have long columns, as do G. elata in China [9]; G. gracilis, G. nipponica, G. verrucosa, G. elata, G. javanica in Japan [10, 11]; G. dioscoreirhiza in Taiwan [12]; G. javanica (syn. G. malayana) and G. zeylanica in Sri Lanka [13, 14, 15]; G. holttumii and G. verrucosa in Malaysia [13, 16, 17]; G. papuana in Papua New Guinea [18]; and G. javanica, G. hasseltii, G. callosa, G. crispa, G. abscondita and G. verrucosa in Java [19]. (According to Jones, G. sesamoides has become naturalised in South Africa after “accidental introduction” in 1944 [20]).


No Gastrodia are listed from New Caledonia [21], the Solomons [22], or from Tonga, Fiji, Nuie and Samoa according to the appropriate Floras.

G. sesamoides is pollinated by a small native bee in Australia [20]. G. “long column” appears to be self-pollinating by its flowers turning upward on the stem as they mature, allowing pollen to fall onto the stigma (B. Molloy, personal communication). The short columns of G. cunninghamii and G. minor place the crumbly pollinia squarely onto the stigma – an insect would not be able to get between them to change this obligate self-pollination.

Did the long-columned species drift around from Africa, Madagascar, Sri Lanka, India, Pakistan, the Himalayas, China, Japan, Taiwan, Borneo, Indonesia, Sulawesi, Thailand, Malaysia, PNG, Australia to New Zealand? Was New Zealand the ancestral home of the short-columned Gastrodia, the mutation enhancing its self-pollinating ability to the extent that Gastrodia cunninghamii and G. minor would become highly successful here?

References
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More curious capers recorded by the Corybas crawlers’ columnist: Eric Scanlen

1. Ngunguru, Corybas rotundifolius and all that

It being the middle of winter and wet with it, seven hopelessly hooked NZnoggers travelled from as far as New Plymouth to join one of Allan Ducker's celebrated expeditions on 7 July, this time to ferret out *C. rotundifolius* at Bratty's Reserve, 2 or 3 km west of Ngunguru. "Hopelessly hooked" might seem a bit harsh but why else would anyone go so far, to lie in the leaf mould and the rain just to gaze upon a diminutive plant that fits life sized onto a 35mm slide?

A break in the journey at Eaves Reserve in Orewa, to a chorus of tuis, showed the symbiotic value of seven pairs of eyes. Seven species in flower were quickly identified (see Table) near the ridge top on this old Maori pa site. Cameras and dirty knees at once became evident.

The muddy kneed ragamuffins did not improve NZNog’s image at a shopping stop in Wellsford including a footpath encounter with an immaculately clad Minister of Education.

After establishing itself at Muriel Blumhardt's bach at Langs Beach, the party first pored over massed *Drymoanthus adversus* on totara by the road then it spread out along the ridge at Bream Tail Reserve where native orchids are plentiful. Twenty four species have been counted by Allan and it doesn't include *Pterostylis brumalis*, possibly because of the paucity of its...
close associate, the kauri. Six species were in bloom this Friday, and there were some surprises which got the cameras flashing or rolling as the case may be, including:

- several *Acianthus sinclairii* with pale green leaves covered with orchid pink spots! These were quite healthy and growing side by side with regular dark green leaved ones.

- reddish topped *Pterostylis trullifolia*, just outside the reserve. There was more red on them (on the dorsal sepals) than on many of the plentiful *Pterostylis rubricaulis*

- some *Corybas* with deeply veined, rounded leaves that Allan had spotted previously. His war whoop temporarily deafened those nearby when he discovered that it was *Corybas rotundifolius* in the flesh pink. Only one plant was in bloom and it wasn't properly open. Allan "put his foot in it" back at the cars where Bob Talbot and Malcolm Campbell had gone on ahead; he asked them if they'd heard the Yahoo? at which opportunity the column made an indiscreet and entirely regrettable remark.

Back at the bach for a fine dinner, we were regaled with a little red and white and some snippets from Malcolm (who was still convalescing), about his beastly colostomy! What a character.

Saturday saw the two car loads off early to follow their magnificent obsession to Ngunguru. Here we found a new notice from the Department of Conservation, proclaiming "Brattys Reserve", but no entrance. So we stalked in through private property, skirted through the owner's bit of bush to avoid his barking dogs and clambered over his 12 gauge, high tensile fence into almost a lawn of *Cyrtostylis oblonga*. It was in bud but not open anywhere, much to the disappointment of Margaret Menzies and other southerners who hadn't spotted it before.

Graham Marshall had a great eye for *Corybas cheesemanii* which were thick in places, and he seemed to be able to find it under any heap of tea tree debris that Malcolm pointed to.

Sue Bergersen found *Bulbophyllum tuberculatum*, surprisingly at knee height on kauri but that find was overshadowed by the big event – *Corybas rotundifolius*. There were some 50 or more plants, many in full flower as predicted by Allan after he and Al Blumhardt had done a reccy four weeks previously on advice from Noeleen Clements. The party was
intrigued with this unique pink dot, with its off-white to palest pink dorsal sepal and its minute filamentous tepals. This may mean that *C. orbiculatus* or "Short tepals" will have to be renamed "Medium tepals". These transparent sepals and petals were jutting forward and appressed to the pink (or more properly, pale maroon) labellum and would be respectively only 5 and 4 mm long; the petal end sometimes dropping down to cross the sepal. A strong lens looking through the 2 mm x 2 mm, Veed and minutely toothed opening, revealed reverse facing orchid pink whiskers on the kelson of the labellum. Illogical thoughts of a shady affair with a *Calochilus*? The flower stands above the leaf and the plant grows close to *Cyrtostylis oblonga*, as did everything else in this unique bit of bush.

*Back to earth, the party started to straggle out towards lunch and got a clear view of those furiously barking dogs; two Doberman Pinschers were bounding back and forth, unleashed! This glimpse saw Malcolm clutching at his colostomy bag and the vanguard of three retiring with all dignified haste to the bush and that fence. For the record, the dogs did not attack and the owner was quite polite but insistent that an entrance track and stile should be organised into this reserve. Are there any DOC personnel out there?

A picnic lunch at Ngunguru beach preceded a drive home with one last stop at Top O' The Dome Tearooms between Warkworth and Wellsford. The symbiotics soon picked up five species in flower before the gale, the gathering gloom and a heavy downpour drove them (in stockinged feet of course) to a hot coffee in this excellent establishment at the end of the track.
The three from south of the Bombays, who stayed at Ducker's, were treated that evening to close-up videos of the "captives" from the two days' outing (was it only two days?) A thoroughly satisfying time was had by all.

Thank you Allan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Species found in flower at the reserves 7 &amp; 8 July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>Eaves Orewa</th>
<th>Bream Tail</th>
<th>Brattys Ngunguru</th>
<th>Top O The Dome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acianthus sinclairii</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corybas cheesemanii</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. rotundifolius</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. trilobus</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pterostylis alobula</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. brumalis</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. rubricaulis</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. trullifolia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drymoanthus adversus, painting by Claire Scott, Whangarei, c.1930, Auckland Museum.
2. The Menzies/Talbot Corybas cryptanthus expedition

Write down 5 August, central Taranaki, in your NZ orchid diary as the time to find Corybas cryptanthus open. Don’t think you are going to find it then unless you had previously been out in the tea tree (the Leptospermum scoparium variety) in December, found the leafless seed pods standing straight up out of the leaf litter on pellucid stalks, and marked the spot. The wretched things open their huge flowers (for Corybas that is) completely under the tea tree compost and unless you mark the seed pod sites, looking for it in August would be worse than looking for the needle in that hay stack.

Margarie Menzies and Bob Talbot had marked two such ridge-top sites for the NZnoggers and they had monitored these sites near Omoana for weeks beforehand; then on 5 August they unearthed two pink flecked flowers as pellucid as their seed pods, for the contingent to gaze upon, video, photograph and wonder why they had come to such an outback place for this oddball plant.

The two dozen or so obsessives had met the night before at Mangamingi, in Duncan and Margaret’s artistically appointed lounge and by a blazing log fire to discuss tactics and to get allocated one of the several shearing quarters up the road. Margaret had thoughtfully commandeered these (and helped clean them out) ahead of the forestry workers who had done their bit by churning up the road beyond! She also remembered to put the test match on video during the tactics-talking so that long-suffering Duncan and others could watch it into the small hours, after the mob had gone.

Saturday dawned fine, despite an overnight deluge, and cars could be seen negotiating that muddy bench called a road, around the steep papa gully sides unique to Taranaki. Those in the know parked at the foot of the rendezvous driveway where 4WD wagons with 4 wheel chains were just out of sight loading Pinus radiata seedlings. But the column, in a 2WD wagon, blundered on past that lot with rising panic, and survived only by dint of the metal under the mud, some blurted Allan Ducker instructions and good fortune.

Our film crew had already stopped and photographed some early flowering Corybas "As" on seeping, south facing and vertical to overhanging road batters. These batters become completely wall-papered (it could not be termed "carpeted") with dampness-loving plants which sometimes outweigh their adhesion and peel off en masse, exposing unweathered papa beneath. The dark maroon flowered C. "As" had unusual iridescent gold speckles on the dorsal sepals. It appeared as though the speckle had darkened in more mature flowers but this opinion was disputed by some of the pundits who thought that speckle-sepal was a different form or variety. The column's underexposed slides show a crimson speckle.

The high point of the trip was of course the leafless, saprophytic C. cryptanthus and although it couldn't be called beautiful, it had the magnetism to draw the trudging contingent around the mud roads in the face of rowdy 2-stroke
forestry Mokes. It was almost a relief to find that this is one Corybas which doesn't grow at Iwitahi or why else was Trevor Nicholls present? But the trip had nearly been cancelled because only site-two specimens had flowered and they were late to boot. The celebrated pure whites which had flowered the previous year above the moss (Bob has a spectacular 'photo to prove it and he stoutly denies that he picked and repositioned the flower), had refused to show this year - but they will wait. As a bonus, Pterostylis alobula was everywhere and C. cheesemanii was also out but sparse.

After lunch a majority, not trusting the road, climbed onto the back of the Menzies' 4WD pick-up with sheep rails, standing room only and Bob driving, to view some Corybas trilobus and C. orbiculatus further west. The column's sub-group dawdled down the road picking up C. rivularis (was orbiculatus), in bud with tightly wound tepals showing, some C. oblongus in early bud and some few, typically dark maroon C. orbiculatus (was C. "C"), with the usual meandering short green tepals. But across the road from the first big rimu, was a C. orbiculatus with straight, vertical green tepals and a broad labellum like C. "A". It was duly filmed and videoed then, (wrongly) labelled C. "B" because it was intermediate between C. "A" and C. "C". Is all that clear? it wasn't easy to write.

That evening, at the Mangamingi Hall, a fine dinner prepared by Clive Perry and served up by Ann Talbot, Duncan, Joe and Clair Menzies, was enjoyed by all as were some quite brilliant slides of Bob's NZ orchids and Rob Graham's Western Australian ones. Also appreciated was Colin Ogle's intriguing run-down on the past and present orchids in the nearby Ngaere Swamp. Participants with 20-20 vision were treated to a 3-D close up view, through a binocular microscope, of a flawless C. cryptanthus bloom which Margaret assured us, "just fell off" when they were excavating in the leaf litter.

At the do, Ernie Corbett was at pains to explain to the column that C. "B" was indeed C. "Mt Messenger" and that Bruce Irwin had attached the A, B and C labels to the above three when Ernie had pointed out to him their clear differences. Bruce, also at the do, made an announcement that both C. "A" and C. "Mt Messenger" were to earn specific titles (which he did not disclose), in about three months time. The column for one, was relieved because this will sure clear up a lot of confusion.

The real C. "Bs", en masse at the Mt Messenger saddle, were filmed by the home-going sub-group on Sunday the 6th. It wasn't easy either! One full bearded, long haired cameraman and another too old for this sort of thing, took turns at teetering on one leg atop a stumpy log propped in the water table of State Highway 3, but they were blase by now to the puzzled stares of passing motorists. Lesser distractions, as you can imagine, have caused terrible accidents! Getting back to the orchids, most of the almost wholly green plants, still had unravelling knotted tepals but some few were wide open and what a picture they made; a fitting finale to a well organised and memorable expedition.

Thank you Margaret and Bob and all the other hard working contributors.
Close relations: orchids like ours

1. Flower from the front. 2. Flower from the side. 3. Column and top of ovary from side. 4. Top of column from the side to show variation in the crest. 5. Column from the front; the anther is concealed behind the hair-tufts immediately above the rostellum. 6. Anther, rostellum and part of stigma; the hair-tufts removed. a, anther. cr, crest. cw, hair-tufts on column appendages. o, ovary. r, rostellum. s, stigma.
Rasmussen HN and Whigham DF (American Journal of Botany 1993; 80 [12]: 1374-8) wrote on "Seed ecology of dust seeds in situ: a new study technique and its application in terrestrial orchids". They noted that the study of seed ecology in minute seeds, such as those of orchids, is seriously impeded by the difficulty of handling them, and the near-impossibility of tracing them in soil. They constructed seed packets of nylon plankton netting enclosed in labelled plastic photographic slide mounts, and planted these in the soil attached by nylon strings to a pole (see Figure). A year later they were easy to trace, and allowed the researchers to study the germination and seedling development of several species.

Further to your editor's notes on insect pollination in Thelymitra longifolia (J53), I recently became aware of GM Thomson's comments (TNZI 1927; 57: 107) that though there was general agreement that T. longifolia was self-fertilised, "When, however, I was in Stewart Island in January 1880, I found many lilac- and pink-flowered specimens,
which were very conspicuous, and in many of them the pollinia had been removed, showing that insects had visited them”. Those pink T. aff. longifolia keep turning up, further and further south.

I was recently in southern China and bought a nice piece of Chinese brush painting and calligraphy depicting “che lan”, fragrant ribbon-grass, their scented wild Cymbidium. The same plant was also painted in 1306 A.D. by Cheng Sze-shiao, along with his poem (Chinese artist/poets usually embellish their paintings with a few well-chosen words, whereas westerners tend to let the things speak for themselves) -

Always bowing my head I have been
asking the legendary king
Your identity and your journey.
Though no nostril has ever been
tinged by a painting,
The fragrance of long ago is
still hovering in the air.


On 27 August I drove north from Kai Iwi, looping into native bush and wet roadsides, and eventually returning via Papaiti to Wanganui. Every wet bank carried Corybas “A” galore, and one or two had early buds of a later-flowering Corybas. Some good orchid territory there - I’ll be back - Ed.

Is Corybas carsei the same as Corybas fordhamii?

Dan Hatch wrote to say that if it is, then the valid name is C. carsei (1911) which predates C. fordhamii (1941).

Peter de Lange also wrote, "I have never been ‘strangely silent’ on this subject. The draft recovery plan for this species considers determining the exact relationship between C. carsei and C. fordhamii as top priority. Since April 1991 the only known population of C. carsei in New Zealand has been the subject of intensive monitoring and research into manipulating the wetland ecosystem, to try and reverse its decline - the results of this research were the subject of a paper at the Iwitahi Conference in December (see Clarkson et al, NZNOG Journal 1994; 52: 34-36). At that same conference I presented a paper co-authored by Brian Molloy, where we suggested that the term ‘vagrant’ be applied to indigenous orchids which as a result of some specific biological constraint have not successfully established in New Zealand. A ‘boiled down’ summary was reprinted in the last issue of the NZNOG Journal. Although the publication did not list C. carsei as a vagrant we did suggest this status at Iwitahi - and caused some active debate about systematics and research from some Landcare staff present. Since then Brian and I have elected to leave C. carsei out of the current vagrant list if only because there are some slight differences between our plant and the
Australian *C. fordhamii*, viz size, number of stripes on the labellum and the presence or absence of retrorse teeth within the labellum lip, all of which need wider consideration. David Jones has examined fresh material of our *C. carsei* and concluded that it is different from *C. fordhamii*. While I am not convinced of this, I do not profess to be an expert on orchids, and so I leave it to Brian, David Jones and Mark Clements to resolve. However both Brian and I are agreed that the ecology of the species - its sporadic and generally poor seed set, the timing of its discovery in the far north (and later in the Waikato) during periods of intense habitat disturbance - is similar to that of other orchid vagrants, e.g. *Thelymitra matthewsii*, *Caleana minor*, *Chiloglottis formicifera* and *Pterostylis nutans*, and strongly suggests that *C. carsei* is also a vagrant. If it is not then it has very recently diverged from an ancestral *C. fordhamii* migrant. In consideration of these uncertainties Brian and I share the view - *taihoa*! let’s wait a while. Although I can fully understand the desire of some orchid group members to see a taxonomy published on our Orchidaceae, this has been rushed all too often in the past - leaving numerous errors of nomenclatural standing for someone prepared to work through the mess to tidy up. We have a person prepared to do that - Brian Molloy - so why don’t we allow him the time to complete a thorough revision of this family. Brian’s perceived silence on subjects such as these belies the fact that he is making considerable progress on such tricky subjects as the relationship between our *C. carsei* and *C. fordhamii* as well as other problem species pairs such as *Pterostylis nana* and *P. puberula*. You simply cannot speed this process up - we have a lengthy legacy of problematic binomials showing what happens if you do! So in the interim my comment is - while the ecology and reproductive biology of *C. carsei* are consistent with those of other vagrant orchids, there are other factors acting on its decline which are not consistent (e.g. cricket predation, habitat loss). Dan Hatch and others may well be right, but until we know for certain, it is prudent to retain *C. carsei* as an endemic species in the New Zealand orchid flora”.

---

**Orchid artist**

**Norman Bruce Harvey (1931- )**

"I very much regret that Mr Harvey has failed. His gouache pictures show great industry, but it is to no purpose that could not have been better conveyed by photography. The tatters of a windblown branch or an insect-ravaged leaf might be an interesting exercise for the artist,
but their rendering does not constitute an adequate delineation of a species. In many instances, the specimens for drawing have been badly selected. So faithful has Mr Harvey been that the inadequacy is all too evident, and his understanding of the plants was insufficient to make good the deficiencies." [1]

The Listener review was not kind to Bruce Harvey's book *New Zealand botanical paintings*, published in 1969 [2]. The flap of the front cover had claimed that Harvey was "New Zealand's leading exponent (of botanical painting), and with his published collection of forty gouache paintings he shows that he is entitled to a place in the front rank of the world's botanic artists."

Clearly this reviewer disagreed.

Bruce Harvey was born in Palmerston North and educated in Timaru. His first novel *Any old dollars, Mister?* was published in 1964 and a second *One magpie for sorrow* followed in 1968, winning an achievement award from the Literary Fund. By 1970 he was working full time in Auckland painting natural history subjects.

Harvey's *A portfolio of New Zealand birds* appeared in 1970 with his own commentary, published by Reed [3].

R.B. Gibson's review was titled "A lavish and pretentious tome". He began with some praise, "Book collectors and naturalists know Bruce Harvey for his delicate paintings of native plants and flowers", but he went on to slate the bird paintings, which, he wrote, "are frankly inaccurate".

Gibson reserved his harshest comments for the "verbal froth" and the mistakes -

"To enumerate further infelicities would be tedious. The text is a calamitous hotchpotch, marked by loose phrasing, sometimes self-contradictory, and now sinking into sentimental verbiage, now into plain error" [4].

Tough criticisms indeed – the flower paintings slated for their faithfulness in depicting flawed specimens, the bird paintings slated for their unfaithfulness to scientific accuracy.

Among the gouaches in *Botanical paintings* is a depiction of the greenhood *Pterostylis banksii*. Scientifically accurate? Perhaps not - we can tell it is a greenhood, but not much more – it could as easily have been *Pterostylis "Erula"* or *P. graminea*.

I doubt if the paintings were ever meant to be scientific botanical illustrations, despite the publisher's claims. They are artworks, and faithfulness to one's subject, including its deficiencies, should certainly not be taken as a sign of poor quality in an artist. Paradoxically, such faithfulness may not of course result in the best science.

The *Pterostylis* painting is a pleasing thing, nicely composed, the flowers forming the points of an elegant triangle, base down, apex up, the turf from which they rise neatly suggesting an aesthetic debt to Albrecht Durer five hundred years earlier.

Some of Harvey's bird paintings now grace Air New Zealand planes named for native birds.

I think he was treated rather too savagely by the critics of the time – was a professional patch being threatened?

**References**

Pterostylis banksii, gouache by Norman Bruce Harvey, from his *New Zealand botanical paintings*, 1969.
Comparative reproductive biology of two sun-orchids; the vulnerable *Thelymitra circumsepta* and the widespread *T. ixioides* [Orchidaceae].


The reproductive strategies of two *Thelymitras* similar to New Zealand species are reported. Our *T. aff. ixioides* is self-pollinating, and our *T. formosa* is similar to the Australian *T. circumsepta*. The differences between insect-pollinated and self-pollinating Thelymitras are delineated.

*Thelymitra circumsepta* is a vulnerable, localised, swampland species, flowering in December; *T. ixioides* is widespread in woodland-heath, more continuous in distribution, flowering October-November. Both are blue; neither produce scent or nectar.

*T. ixioides* produces an attractive, multiple and long-lasting floral display, at a time when local plants are also flowering, at lower temperatures in October-November; its pollinia are easily removed intact, and in the wild native bees respond to the visual stimulus and do this, so that 28% of the flowers produce fruit. The bees also deposit pollen from other plants in the community, but the other flowers do not resemble *T. ixioides*; furthermore the lack of fragrance forces the bee to use only visual stimuli. The low numbers of *T. ixioides* compared with other flowers in the community means there are few encounters between bee and orchid, so the deception is only slowly learned.

*T. circumsepta* has few flowers open at once, when it is hot in December, then only briefly, when few local plants are flowering. Its pollinia are mealy. The rarity of the orchid itself, and of other local flowers, are strong selective pressures for self-pollination because insects are not attracted to the locality.

Self-pollination may confer advantages on the plant, in that offspring are genetically similar to the parents who have already adapted to the environment.
Column structure of *Thelymitra ixioides* (1A–C) and *T. circumsepta* (2A–C). (A). Frontal view of the column. (B). Side view of the column. (C). Half flower with perianth removed. A=anther, AP=anther point, CA=column arms, ML=midlobe, O=ovary, P=pollinium, PAL=post anther lobe, S=stigma, SC=stylar canal, T=trichomes, V=viscidium.
**Thelymitra ixioides**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flowers</th>
<th>Broad stigma hides pollinia which are easily removed intact (see Figure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floral display</strong></td>
<td>Mean 5.2 flowers/spike with 3.4 open at once; open 2.9 days; 83% of population open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floral community</strong></td>
<td>Many other woodland species flower at same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rates of removal &amp; deposition of pollinia</strong></td>
<td>20-28% had pollinia removed; 49-64% had pollen deposited on stigma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flower to fruit conversion ratio</strong></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insects</strong></td>
<td>Hoverflies did not pollinate; native bees did (see Figure).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pollen collected from stigma</strong></td>
<td>Orchid pollen, but also pollen from many other species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hand pollination experiments</strong></td>
<td>No difference in rates of fruiting among pollinations from same flower, same plant or different plants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thelymitra circumsepta**

| Stigma narrows at top to reveal pollinia which come into direct contact with stigmatic edge; pollinia not easily removed intact 7.5 fls/spike, 1.2 open at once; open 1 day; 16% of total population open at all. |
| No other native plants flowering concurrently |
| Never, never |
| 96% |
| One native bee visited but did not pollinate. |
| None |
| No differences |

**Comment**

These observations confirm much of what has been written of *Thelymitra* pollination. New information includes the different shapes of the stigmas between the insect-pollinated and the self-pollinating species. Also fascinating is the observation that insect-pollinated species flower at a time when other plants are flowering profusely – so that insects on the wing are in higher numbers. Perhaps our insect-pollinated *Thelymitra longifolia* flowers when the manuka is out? keep an eye out for manuka, native bees and *T. longifolia* this season.

Bruce Irwin remarked, “I was interested to find that the authors backed up the thoughts I’ve developed over the years that insect-pollinated species have pollinia in compact units which do not crumble and spill over stigmas as do pollinia of self-pollinating species. I don’t think I’ve actually seen any explanation of the fact that in *Thelymitra* the pollinia are attached to the viscid disc and so are pulled out of
the anther case which is carried upward by continuing growth of the upper part of the column as the bud matures. In insect-pollinated plants the coherent pollinia are neatly stored behind the stigma whereas in self-pollinating forms the pollinia are pulled more onto the top of the stigma and because the pollen grains separate readily some spill onto the front of the stigma. So far so good, but populations of *T. aff. longifolia* near Whakatane which store their pollinia apparently well clear of the receptive part of the stigma, set seed very freely.

“I presume that the insects are not very efficient pollinators. I think the flowers are self-pollinated by pollen tubes growing through from the back of the stigma as in *Orthoceras*. At least these flowers give the insects a chance to cross pollinate, whereas *T. pauciflora* seems always to be self-pollinating before the bud opens.

“*Thelymitra ‘comet’* (Bill Liddy’s pink flower from the Kaweka Range) appears to behave much the same as the Whakatane *T. longifolia* but in my shadehouse they set no seed. Maybe this form will not accept its own pollen. I hope to check pollination in *T. Whakapapa* next season.

Tony Slater reported (ANOS Victorian Group Bulletin 1995; March: 11-14) on the time when the stigmatic surface of the orchid flower is most receptive to pollination. The Australian Orchid Foundation had helped fund his research. Earlier research had shown that individual orchid stigmas all produce copious secretion, though they may have different papillae. Slater confirmed these observations, and showed that the stigmatic papillae of *Dendrobium* and *Sarcochilus* were constructed of detached viable cells, *Diuris* and *Caladenia* had multicellular papillae, and *Microtis* and *Pterostylis* had unicellular papillae. The stigmas of all these orchids were wet with secretion throughout the period the flowers were open. They are therefore receptive throughout, though the optimum time for pollination is soon after the flower has opened.

Garry Guide wrote (NOSSA Journal 1995; 19: 17) on an 11 February field trip to swamps that supply Tookayerta Creek: “Despite the drought the springs here were still flowing. All through the sedges and ti-tree were hundreds of the white, self-pollinating *Spiranthes*... On the very edge of the track was a perfect pink and white *Spiranthes sinensis*, and directly opposite *Cryptostylis subulata* in full flower. It was fairly obvious that the pink *Spiranthes* were largely confined to the edges of the swamps and had mostly finished while the white ones were only in the middle of the swamp and were in full bloom. On both forms we observed red and black native bees working the flowers.”

Loc. cit. Bob Bates reported *Pterostylis tasmanica* “from a few swamp areas in the south-east” of South Australia, extending its known range.
ANOS Victorian Group Bulletin April 1995 reported that the recently released *Flora of Victoria*, Volume 2, lists *Thelymitra cyanea* along with *T. venosa* and *T. pulchella* as one complex (*T. venosa* complex).

Helene Wild reported (ANOS Victorian Group Bulletin 1995; April: 2-4) a talk by Andrew Paget on orchid seeds. Orchid seeds are so tiny, and produced in such numbers, that they are often called "dust seed". Seeds are generally less than 1mm long and weigh from less than 0.5 to 14 micrograms. The embryo is tightly enclosed in a transparent seed coat (testa) and lacks the food reserves (endosperm) of, e.g., wheat seed. Orchid seed has to get its food in other ways, and in nature it will only germinate if it comes into contact with a mycorrhizal fungus – in the soil, on the bark of trees, or elsewhere.

Few seeds make such contact in nature, so few of the many produced ever do germinate. In the laboratory the modern technician can provide an ideal artificial environment for orchid seed germination. Seed is stored cold – *Thelymitra* seed kept for five years at room temperature is no good, but after seven years in a domestic fridge 100% germinates.
The influence of bush fires on Australian orchid growth and flowering has been a recurring preoccupation over there. Some species only flower after a burn, and the current understanding is that burns need to be frequent, because otherwise the fire is too hot, destroying the underground tubers. The West Australian Native Orchid Study and Conservation Group newsletter of July 1995 carried an interesting press release from Kingsley Dixon and co-workers at Kings Park and Botanic Garden and the Botany Department at the University of Western Australia. Studies of 200 difficult-to-germinate species revealed that smoke-derived substances caused tenfold to total promotion of germination, to the extent that some species have been grown easily and effectively from seed for the first time. The technique is simple – a lidded 100 litre drum is fitted with an air inlet at the bottom. Fresh and dry native vegetation is burned with just enough air to allow combustion without flames. An outlet (1.2m of 30mm piping cooled by moisture) at the top leads the smoke to a tent containing trays of seed, which are smoked for about an hour, then sown. Watering is kept to a minimum to prevent the smoke factor being washed out. Most species germinate within six weeks. The process will probably be helpful in a broad range of Australian plants, including orchids, and it suggests controlled burning of habitat for the maintenance of species that are fire-dependant. Research into applying the results to habitat and rare species continues – as well as attempts to refine the effective chemical factors.

Your editor had the good fortune to be attending a conference near Adelaide in early August, and was hosted on a field trip to Belair Park near the city by members of the Native Orchid Society of South Australia. It was early in the season, even for balmy Australia, but I saw Acianthus caudatus and A. pusillus in flower, as well as Corybas dilatata, and seven Pterostylis species – Pp. cucullata, curta, longifolia, nana, nutans, robusta and sanguinea. I spoke at an informal gathering of SA enthusiasts – including that mine of knowledge Bob Bates – on NZ natives, and was interested to hear people say that several of our “aff.” species are indeed different from the Australian species (I refer to Pterostylis cycnocephala, Thelymitra ixioides, Caladenia carnea, Caladenia iridescens, and Prasophyllum patens).
A group of South Australian orchids, photographed in early August: previous page Corybas dilatata; left and middle – Pterostylis nutans; right – Pterostylis nana.

A list of the New Zealand orchids

The last major classification of the NZ orchids was that by Lucy Moore in Flora of NZ (1970) Vol II. What follows is a personal and nonprofessional list of what your editor believes to be the current status. Notes after each species refer to changes since 1970.
Acianthus sinclairii (in Flora II as Acianthus formicatus var. sinclairii)

Acianthus viridis (has also been known as Townsonia viridis, T. deflexa)

Adenochilus gracilis

Aporostylis bifolia

Bulbophyllum pyrgmaeum

Bulbophyllum tuberculatum

Caladenia alata (in Flora II included in C. carnea as var. exigua. See Hatch E.D. and McCrae D. NZNOG Newsletter 1989. 32: 5-6)

Caladenia carnea (in Flora II as C. carnea var. bartlettii. See Jones D. Native orchids of Australia. Reed, Frenchs Forest, 1988. p95-96)

Caladenia catenata (this is now regarded as R. Brown’s C. alba, and is said not to be present in NZ)


Caladenia minor (in Flora II as C. carnea var. minor)

Caladenia lyallii (there may be two species currently included – see Gibbs M. NZNOG Journal 1990; 35: 19, and The NZ orchids: natural history and cultivation (20)

Caladenia aff. lyallii (see above)

Caladenia "green column" (undescribed; a white form may be a further undescribed species)

Caleana minor (occasional Australian visitor, not a Paracaleana)

Calochilus herbaceus (occasional Australian visitor, in Flora II as C. campestris. See McCrae D. NZNOG Newsletter 1987. 24: 9)

Calochilus paludosus

Calochilus robertsonii

Chiloglottis cornuta

Chiloglottis formicifera (occasional Australian visitor, probably extinct in New Zealand)

Chiloglottis valida (occasional Australian visitor, not in Flora II; has been included by mistake in C. gunnii, but described as a new species by Jones D.L. Aust. Orch. Res. 2. 1991. 43-4, 154)


Corybas cryptanthus

Corybas macranthus

Corybas oblongus

Corybas orbiculatus (this is not the species named C. orbiculatus in Flora II, but is the species that has been known as C. “short tepals”; see Molloy B. NZNOG Journal 1994. 51: 12-14).

Corybas rivularis (there are perhaps seven distinct species currently in this complex; one was misnamed C. orbiculatus in Flora II and is now known by the older Hatch name C. macranthus var. longipetalus as well as by Irwin’s tagname C. “Waiouru”, others include C. “Kaimai”, C. “Kerikeri”, C. “whiskers”, C. “rest area”, C. “A” and C. “Mt Messenger”; [Irwin J.B. NZNOG Newsletter 1989. 32: 1-4. NZNOG Journal 1993. 47: 7-9. NZNOG Journal 1995. 55: 22-24]. The original Acianthus [Corybas] rivularis is probably C. “Kerikeri”)

Corybas rotundifolius (was included in C. unguiculatus and later tagged C. aff. unguiculatus – see Hatch E.D. NZNOG Journal 1991. 38: 4-5)

Corybas trilobus (there may be more than one species currently included in this name – e.g.

Corybas aff. trilobus (see St George IM. NZNOG Newsletter 1988: 28: 10-13).

Cryptostylis subalata (Australian visitor, now well established in Northland; not listed in Flora II. See Graham D.K.F. NZ Journal of Botany 1976. 14: 275)

Cyrtostylis oblonga (in Flora II as Acianthus reniformis var. oblonga. See Jones D. and Clements M. Lindleyana 1987. 2 (3): 156)

Cyrtostylis reniformis (in Flora II as Acianthus reniformis var. reniformis. See Jones and Clements ibid)

Dendrobium cunninghamii

Drymoanthus adversus

Drymoanthus flavus (see Molloy & St George. NZJBot 1994; 32: 415-421)

Earina aestivalis (reinstated; though many still think it is just a form of Earina mucronata; illustrated in The New Zealand orchids: natural history and cultivation 1990. 14. f13)

Earina autumnalis

Earina mucronata

Gastrodia cunninghamii

Gastrodia minor
Gastrodia aff. sesamoides (now regarded as
different from the Australian species – see Ogle C.
NZNOG Journal 1994. 51: 9)
Gastrodia “long column” (in Flora II included in
G. sesamoides. See Wilson H. Field Guide –
Stewart Island plants 1982. p294)
Genoplesium nudum (was Prasophyllum nudum –
Genoplesium pumilum (was Prasophyllum
37: 18)
Lyperanthus antarcticus (probably not a
Lyperanthus)
Microtis oligantha
Microtis parviflora
Microtis unifolia
Orthoceras novae-zeelandiae (was regarded as
identical with O. strictum, but see Clements M.A.
Australian orchid res. 1989. 1: 100)
Prasophyllum colensoi
Prasophyllum aff. patens (was regarded as
identical with the Australian P. patens, but now
thought to be an undescribed New Zealand
species)
Pterostylis alobula
Pterostylis areolata
Pterostylis australis
Pterostylis banksii
Pterostylis brunalis
Pterostylis cardiostigma (not listed in Flora II. See
Cooper D. NZ Journal of Botany 1983. 21 (1):
97)
Pterostylis aff. cycnocephala (was regarded as
identical with the Australian P. cycnocephala, but
now thought to be an undescribed New Zealand
species)
Pterostylis foliata
Pterostylis graminea
Pterostylis aff. graminea (undescribed)
Pterostylis humilis
Pterostylis irioniana
Pterostylis “linearis” (treated by Hatch in 1949 as
a variety of P. furcata, and in Flora II under P.
montana – now considered to be a valid species)
Pterostylis micromega (has been confused with P.
furcata, but now regarded as distinct)
Pterostylis montana
Pterostylis aff. montana (probably several
undescribed species, but for details of one of the
species currently tagged “aff montana”, see St
George I.M. NZNOG Newsletter 1988. 25: 12)
Pterostylis nutans (occasional Australian visitor
recently seen at Waihaha near Taupo)
Pterostylis oliveri
Pterostylis patens (was included in P. bankstii, now
regarded as distinct)
Pterostylis puberula (some of the various forms of
P. nana are occasional Australian visitors, and P.
puberula was included in P. nana – but is
regarded by some as distinct)
Pterostylis rubricaulis (treated as a variety of P.
montana by Hatch and as a variety of P.
graminea in Flora II, now considered a valid
species)
Pterostylis tasmanica (in Flora II as P. barbata;
has also been confused with P. plumosa. See
Molloy B. NZNOG Journal 51: 14-16)
Pterostylis tristis (in Flora II as P. mutica. See
Molloy B. Proc. 2nd Int. Orch. Conf. 1985. p2)
Pterostylis trullifolia
Pterostylis venosa
Pterostylis “Catlina” (undescribed; illustrated in St
George IM. Wild orchids in the far south of NZ)
Pterostylis “Erua” (undescribed; see Irwin JB.
NZNOG Journal 1993; 45: 15-17)
Spiranthes sinensis
Spiranthes "Motutangi" (undescribed)
Thelemitra aemula (see Molloy B.P.J. and Hatch
E.D. NZNOG Journal 1990. 35: 20-24)
Thelemitra carnea
Thelemitra cyanea (was confused – e.g. in Flora II
— with the Australian T. venosa)
Thelemitra decora
Thelemitra dentata (a sterile hybrid T. pauciflora x
pulchella)
Thelemitra formosa
Thelemitra hatchii
Thelemitra intermedia (regarded as identical with
Thelemitra pauciflora, a name which however
contains many forms -see below)
Thelemitra aff. ixioides (regarded as identical with
the Australian T. ixioides, but the NZ species is
self-pollinating, and the Australian insect-
pollinated)
Thelemitra longifolia
Thelemitra aff. longifolia (undescribed species,
appears to be insect-pollinated)
Thelemitra malvina (not listed in Flora II. See
Clements M.A. Australian orchid research 1991.
1: 141)
Thelemitra matthewsii
The New Zealand Native Orchid Group

The New Zealand Native Orchid Group

Thelymitra pauciflora (perhaps several species including those tagged as T. "Ahipara", T. "daride", T. "rough leaf" and T. "pseudopauciflora". Clements appears to regard NZ forms of this highly variable species as "T. colensoi")

Thelymitra pulchella

Thelymitra sansculia (see Flora II p130 – may be reinstated as a species)

Thelymitra tholiformis (considered to be T. "intermedia" by Moore, and included in T. aemula by Hatch: but see Molloy B.P.J. and Hatch E.D. NZNOG Journal 1990. 35: 20-24)

Thelymitra “Whakapapa” (undescribed – see NZNOG Journal 1995; 54: 7-8)

Yoania australis (probably not a Yoania, but may be an endemic New Zealand genus).

Oop! The drawing labelled Caleana minor (J56 p10) actually included, at lower right, a drawing of the flower of Caleana major for comparison. The flower of C. minor is upper right; the whole plant illustrated at left is also C. minor.

David Jones and Mark Clements will be in Christchurch in early December conferring with Brian Molloy on progress with their checklist of the New Zealand orchids, to be published soon. Brian reports that he is hopeful that the publication will contain a colour section. The papers read at Brian’s farewell conference at Lincoln in September will be published in a special edition of the Journal of the Royal Society, including Brian’s own paper on Thelymitra.
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STOP PRESS

Pterostylis nutans in NZ again

In 1991 Cathy Jones and Bruce Irwin were botanising near Waihaha west of Taupo. It was a wet day and the track was greasy. Bruce slipped coming downhill - his feet shot out from under him, and he cracked the back of his head on the ground. In his dazed state he thought he saw strange rosettes of an unusual Pterostylis. As his head cleared he knew he was looking at strange rosettes of an unusual Pterostylis. At least that is how Bruce tells it.

Those of us who know him realise of course that he has a keen eye for anything new. The list of his
discoveries tells a tale of a keen observer, always on the alert. Readers of this Journal will be aware of his discoveries of different species within the Corybas rivularis complex. If Bruce thought this was something new, then certainly it was.

A year later the colony had almost doubled to 24 plants [5]. At that stage no flower had been seen, and although Bruce had suspected that this was Pterostylis nutans (in fact he had carried in some Australian plants for comparison), he was yet uncertain. In 1994 he, Brian Molloy and I visited the spot in December, and found one unidentifiable dead flowerhead - too late, alas!

I had seen Pterostylis nutans flowering in South Australia in early August. We returned to Waihaha in mid-October in 1995. It was a dreadful day - a southerly bringing sulphurous whiffs of nearby Ruapehu on its icy breath. John Dodunski, Margaret Menzies and Bob Talbot braved the conditions too.

We were well rewarded. In 1995 there are 26 plants in a colony 40 x 120 cm. Two had flower stems - one was dried up and unfertilised, the other a delightful fresh nodding greenhood. Indubitably Pterostylis nutans.

Pterostylis nutans is an Australian orchid that is a classic example of what de Lange and Molloy [1] call vagrant species in New Zealand. That is to say it is “part of an ongoing process of immigrant orchids arriving at different times, barely establishing a foothold, and disappearing”. Pterostylis nutans, like Chiloglottis valida and Chiloglottis formicifera, is insect-pollinated in Australia, but its specific pollinator is not present in New Zealand, so it fails to establish beyond its point of landfall.

Thomas Cheeseman received a specimen from HB Matthews who found it on the “crest of a ridge leading to Pukemiro Hill, near Kaitaia”; Cheeseman thought it was new, and dedicated it in 1914 to its discoverer by calling it Pterostylis matthewsii [2]. Matthews’s photograph shows a group of five plants. HMR Rupp recognised that it was the Australian Pterostylis nutans and said so in 1932 [3].

Dan Hatch has related the second discovery of Pterostylis nutans in New Zealand [4]. Lucy Cranwell found it by a gunpost at Castor Bay on Auckland’s North Shore in 1942, on “heavy pipeclay, bared in parts by the military stationed there”.

Now in 1991-1995 we have the third confirmed sighting of this vagrant visitor.
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