ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are thankful to Dr. P.K. Hajra, Director, Botanical Survey of India for his valuable suggestions and encouragement. Thanks to Dr. (Mrs.) R. Dutta, Shaibal Bose, Dr. S. Bandyopadhyay of Botanical Survey of India and Dr. G.G. Maity of Kalyani University for help.

SUNIT MITRA,
SUBHAJIT BANDYOPADHYAY AND
V. MUDGAL

Botanical Survey of India, Howrah

THE CORRECT ASCRIPTION OF THE COMBINATION *STACHYTARPHETA CAYENNENSIS* (VERBENACEAE)

The combination *Stachytarpheta cayennensis* has been traditionally ascribed to Vahl (1804) with the epithet spelt variously. Brenan (1950) stated, "Vahl spelt the epithet '*cajanensis*'—a version so different from the original as in effect to constitute a new name and a quite unjustifiable one. Link's later 'compromise'—'*cayanensis*' does not affect the problem". Hence, Brenan (1950) ascribed the combination to Schauer (1847) who in his opinion was the first author to transfer Richard's epithet "*cayennensis*" to *Stachytarpheta* even though Schauer spelt the generic name *Stachytarpha* and attributed the combination to Vahl. However, it seems that it was Kunth (1817) who first used the epithet "*cayennensis*". But he too attributed the combination to Vahl and spelt the epithet *(Verbena)* "*cajanensis*" in the basionym. following Brenan, Hepper (1963) ascribed the combination to Schauer. Nair *et al.* (1982), who reported the occurrence of S. *cayennensis* in India, also ascribed the combination to Schauer.

It is clear that Richard while describing the species derived the specific epithet from the name of the type locality—Cayenne, the capital of the then French Guiana. Vahl (1804), when transferred the species to the genus *Stachytarpheta* though spelt the specific epithet as *"cajanensis"* in the proposed combination and in the epithet bringing name as *(Verbena) "cajanonsis"* (use of "o" in the place of "e" is, probably, a printer's error), he gave a full and direct reference to the author of the basionym, its original place of publication and the type locality—"*Act. Soc. h. n. par.* 1. p.105., Habitat in Cajenna, Richard". It may be seen from the above that Vahl (*l.c.*) spelt the geographical name "Cayenne/Cayenna" as "Cajenna" simply to transcribe the name into Latin for he only replaced the letter "y", foreign to classical Latin alphabet, by the letter "j". Without going into the controversy whether transliteration of the specific epithet "*cayennensis*" to "*cajanensis*" conforms to Latin usage, contrary to Brenan (1950), it can be safely presumed that Vahl's specific epithet is a Latinized version of the geographical name— 'Cayenne', from which Richard too derived his specific epithet. Since use of the letter 'y' is permissible in Latin plant names (Art. 73.4), the original spelling of the specific epithet has to be restored while attributing the combination to Vahl (Art. 73). The correct author citation is provided below.

Stachytarpheta cayennensis (Rich.) Vahl, Enum. Pl. 1 : 208. 1804 (as "*cajanensis*") ; Kunth in HBK, Nov. Gen. Sp. 2 : 280. 1817 ; Link, Enum. Pl. Hort. Berol. Alt. 1 : 18. 1821 (as "*Stachytarpha cayanensis*") ; Cham. in Linnaea 7 : 243. 1832 (as "*cajanensis*") ; Walp., Repert. Bot. Syst. 4 : 5. 1845 (as "*cajanensis*") ; Schauer in DC., Prodr. 11 : 562. 1847 (as "*Stachytarpha*") ; Bocquillon in Adansonia 3 : 241. 1863 ; Briq. Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 4(3a) : 154. 1895 ; Briq. in Annuaire Conserv. Jard. Bot. Geneve 7 & 8 : 317. 1904 ; Hall. f. in Meded. Rijks-Herb. 3 :20. 1918 ; Danser in Ann. Jard. Bot. Buitenzorg 40 : 3. t. 2. 1929 (as "*cajanensis*") ; Mold. in Lilloa 4 :

299. 1939 ; A.D J. Meeuse in Blumea 5 : 69. 1942 ; Brenan in Kew Bull. 5 : 223. 1950 (comb. ascrib. to Schauer 1847) ; Hepper in Huber *et al.*, Fl. W. Trop. Africa 2 : 484. 1963 (comb. ascrib. to Schauer 1847) ; Mold. in Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 60 : 77. 1973, excl. syn. *S. dichotoma* (Ruiz Lopez & Pavon) Vahl 1804 ; Jafri & Ghafoor in Nasir & Ali, Fl. W. Pakistan 77 : 14. 1974 ; Nair *et al.*, in J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 79 : 230. 1982 (comb. ascrib. to Schauer 1847).

Verbena cayennensis Rich. in Actes Hist. Soc. Nat. Paris 1 : 105. 1792.—*Type* : Guyane–Francaise, 1792, *M. Leblond* 356 (G, photo!).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are thankful to Dr. N. P. Balakrishnan, formerly Joint Director, Botanical Survey of India, Coimbatore, for his encouragment ; the Director, Conservatoire et Jardin Botaniques, Geneve, for sending a photograph of the type ; Dr. D. H. Nicolson (US), for his opinion on the original draft, and the anonymous reviewer for his magnanimous criticism and help. A.R. is thankful to the Director, Botanical Survey of India, for a senior research fellowship.

P. DANIEL AND A. RAJENDRAN
Botanical Survey of India, Coimbatore

SPIGELIA ANTHELMIA L. (SPIGELIACEAE) — NEW TO THE FLORA OF PENINSULAR INDIA

The Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve was explored for a comprehensive flora. Material of a certain characteristic herbaceous species, collected at the Tuticorin harbour, located at the southern end of the East Coast, the like of which did not exist at MH, could not be determined initially with the help of Indian floras. Later on, with the help of an expert and floras of neighboring regions it was determined as *Spigelia anthelmia* L. of the Spigeliaceae, a native of South America. A subsequent perusal of more recent Indian literature showed that Oomachan and Shrivastava (1987) had earlier reported this as an addition to the flora of India from Madhya Pradesh. However, as the description given by Oomachan and Shrivastava (1987) seems to have been based mostly on the earlier one by Leenhouts (1962), and certain figures provided by them are at variance, a detailed description based on the material collected in the Gulf of Mannar and an illustration are provided. Critical notes are presented on certain morphological features as well as ecology. The probable entry route which the earlier Indian authors did not touch upon is discussed.

Spigelia anthelmia L., Sp. Pl. : 149. 1753; Leenhouts in Steenis, Fl. Males. I, 6: 376. 1962; Oomachan & Shrivastava in J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 84 : 730. 1987; H. Naithani, Fl. Pl. India, Nepal, Bhutan : 290. 1990 (Fig. 1 A I).

Annual herb, up to 45 cm high; stem terete, 2 5 mm across, glabrous, fluted; internodes 4 - 20 cm long; branches opposite, 2 6 at each node. Leaves sessile, opposite-decussate, terminal, 4 (-6) clustered at apex with almost invisible internodes and basal most pair of leaves connected by interpetiolar stipules, ovate-lanceolate, decurrent at base, entire, and usually minutely bristly along margins above, attenuate at apex, 3 13 × 1 6 cm, scabrid above, nerves up to 8 pairs, minutely scabrous on nerves beneath; stipules triangular, obtuse at apex. Inflorescence a monochasial scorpioid cyme, trichotomous; the terminal one up to 15 cm long, up to 50-flowered; lateral ones 5 8 cm long, 16 26-flowered. Flowers actinomorphic, bisexual; bracts linear, *ca* 2.5 mm long. Calyx 5-lobed, persistent; lobes linear-lanceolate, acute, unequal, 2.5 4 × 0.2 - 0.4 mm, basally connate for *ca* 0.5 mm, 1-nerved, minutely spinulose along margins and nerve. Corolla