NOTE ON THREE ENDEMIC TAXA OF THE GENUS *IPOMOEA* L. IN INDIA

While working on the genus *Ipomoea* L. (Convolvulaceae) for the "Flora of India", it was noticed that sixty taxa (fifty four at the rank of species, two as sub-species and four as varieties) occur in India. Of these, this note records the distributions of one species and two varieties endemic to India and cites specimens of recent collections as deposited in BSI, BLAT and a new combination at a varietal rank is proposed. *I. deccana* D. Austin var. *lobata* (Clarke) Johri comb. nov. has been collected after a lapse of 100 years from the date of its type collections.

1. I. cairica (L.) Sweet var. **semine-glabra** (Blatt. & Hallb.) Bhandari, Fl. Ind. Desert 253. 1978. *I. palmata* Forsk. var. *semine-glabro* Blatt. & Hallb. in Journ. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 26 : 546. 1919.

Distribution : Rajasthan (Vinjorai, Jaisalmer District). This variety could not be collected after its type collection.

2. I. clarkei Hook. f. Fl. Brit. Ind. 4 : 734. 1885 (in Add. & Corr.) ; Cooke, Fl. Pres. Bomb. 2 : 245. 1905 (Repr. ed. 2 : 314. 1958) ; Raiz. Suppl. Duthie's Fl. Upper Gang. Pl. 162. 1976.

Syntypes : Malabar and Concan. *Stocks, Law & C.*

Distribution : Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra.

Specimens examined : MAHARASHTRA : Pune Distt., Dhak hill, Junnar, *Hemadri* 117993 (BSI 71992) ; Khandala, *Santapau* 5148 (BLAT).

3. I. deccana D. Austin var. **lobata** (Clarke) Johri, *comb. nov. I. bracteata* Wight var. *lobata* Clarke in Hook. f. Fl. Brit. Ind. 4 : 204. 1883.

Syntypes : S. Deccan Peninsula, *Wight, Stocks, Law.*

Distribution : Maharashtra, Kerala.

Specimens examined : MAHARASHTRA : Begur, *s. l.* s. n. (BLAT). KERALA : Karayalarthopi, Ariankavu, *K. M. Subramaniam* 77382 (BSI 54621).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Shiva Sharma for guidance and going through the manuscript ; also to the Director, Botanical Survey of India for the award of fellowship.

SUDHIR CHANDRA JOHRI

Deptt. of Botany, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur

NOMENCLATURAL NOTES ON *GEUM* L. SUBG. *GENICULOHIRTISTYLIS* PANIGR. *ET* PUROHIT (ROSACEAE) AND ITS TYPIFICATION

Prain (1904) described and illustrated *Geum (Sieversia) sikkimense* based on three gatherings made from western Sikkim *viz.* 1. Onglathang, near Jongri, June 1887, *King's collector* s.n. (K, CAL) ; 2. unspecified locality, 1880, *King's Collector* s.n. (K) ; 3. Hewalungi ('Huhalunghi'), Sept. 1901, *Prain's Collector* s.n. (204) (K, CAL). Study of the original materials, as also photograph of the syntype no. 1 in K (Photo-CAL) and dissection of floral parts of 7 specimens (including the syntype materials in CAL) led us to confirm Ludlow's (1976) findings that *Geum sikkimense* sensu Prain comprises two taxonomic species :

(i) *Geum sikkimense* Prain (1904) lecto-

typified with *Dr. King's Collector* s.n. (item 2, K) (by Ludlow, 1976) and the syntype listed in item 1 above.

(ii) *Geum macrosepalum* Ludlow (1976) based on *Ludlow, Sheriff & Hicks* 19171 collected from Pangothang, Tsampa in Bhutan on 16th June 1949 (holotype BM) and *Prain's Collector* 204 from Hewalungi—vide item 3 above and cited by Ludlow as a paratype.

Panigrahi & Purohit (1979) rightly recognised that *Geum macrosepalum* Ludlow (1976) could not be included in the subg. *Micracomastylis* (F. Bolle) Robertson (1974) comprising *G. sikkimense* Prain as a syntype species. They described, with Latin diagnosis, the subg. *Geniculohirtistylis* Panigrahi et Purohit (1979) based on characters of *G. macrosepalum* Ludlow, but committed a serious error in citing *G. sikkimense* Prain as its type species, in lieu of *G. macrosepalum* Ludlow, albeit due to oversight. Although this mistake was rectified by them through their subsequent publications (1981, 1983), both *Geniculohirtistylis* Panigrahi & Purohit (1979) based on *G. sikkimense* Prain and *Geniculohirtistylis* Panigrahi & Purohit (1981, 1983) unequivocally typified with *G. macrosepalum* Ludlow, must be rejected as *nom. illegit* (Art. 63. 1, ICBN 1978). Since *G. macrosepalum* Ludlow can not now be assigned to any legitimately-described subgenus, we propose subg. *Constrictohirtistylis* subg. nov. to replace subg. *Geniculohirtistylis* Panigrahi et Purohit (1979, 1981, 1983), provide the latin diagnosis and typify it with *G. macrosepalum* Ludlow as set out below.

Geum L. subg. **Constrictohirtistylis** Panigrahi *et* Purohit, *subg. nov.*

Affine subgeneric Geo (*Geum*) sed differt stylo constricto infra medium, parte distali hirsutus deciduaque parte proximali (rostrum) persistenti hirsutus, apice *non* uncinata.

Type species : *Geum macrosepalum* Ludlow, Bull. Brit. Mus. N. H. 5(5) : 271-272. 1976.

Geum L. subg. **Geniculohirtistylis** Panigrahi *et* Purohit in Proc. 4th Ann. Conf. Orissa Bot. Soc. : 25. 1979, *nom. superfl. illegit* (Art. 63.1 ICBN 1978) ; p.p. excludo typo.

Geum L. subg. **Geniculohirtistylis** Panigrahi *et* Purohit in Bull. Bot. Surv. India 21 : 128, 1981 et JIBS 62(1) : 66. 1983 *nom. illegit* (Art. 63.1).

G. PANIGRAHI AND K. M. PUROHIT
Botanical Survey of India, Howrah

A NOTE ON THE TOPOTYPIC COLLECTION OF *KALANCHOE BHIDEI* COOKE (CRASSULACEAE) AFTER EIGHT DECADES

During the course of botanical explorations in Satara district, Maharashtra, the senior author came across an interesting plant of genus *Kalanchoe* Adans. On critical examination of the specimen it turned out to be *Kalanchoe bhidei* Cooke named after its collector R. K. Bhide, who collected it from Shirgaon ghat between Wai & Wathar, Satara district in the year 1902. A scrutiny of the herbarium of Botanical Survey of India, Western Circle, Pune (BSI) revealed that this species is not represented there. However, the isotype (No. 1243) is deposited at the herbarium of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (K). The present collection of this species after eight decades