NOTES ON INDIAN DESERT PLANTS 4-NEW NAMES AND COMBINATIONS

M. M. BHANDARI

Botany Department, University of Jodhpur, Jodhpur

Following new names and combinations have resulted during a study of the Flora of the Indian Desert. The basionyms of new combinations and the reasons for the new names are given.

Anticharis senegalensis (Walpers) Bhandari comb. nov. Doratenthera senegalensis Walp. Repert. 3: 305, 1844-45. D. linearis Benth. in DC. Prodr. 10: 347, 1846. Anticharis linearis (Benth.) Hochst. ex Aschers. in Montasb. Akad. Wiss. Ber. 882, 1866 (Syntype CAL, 318943, Cardofonum, 30.7.1839).

The earliest validly published name for this species is Doratenthera senegalensis Walpers (1844-45). Walpers based his species on the generic description of Doratenthera provided by Endlicher (Gen. Pl. 685, 1836-40). Endlicher in his turn based his new genus on a letter written by Bentham dated the 7th July 1838. De Candolle in 1846 described Doratenthera linearis, which was also based on the same type as D. senegalensis Walpers. Since D. linearis was validly published in the sense of the Code only in the year 1846, D. senegalensis Walpers has priority over it. The latter epithet, therefore, needs a new combination in the genus Anticharis.

Convolvulus auricomus (A. Rich.) Bhandari comb. nov. C. congestus R. Br. in Salt. Abyss. Ixiv: 1814 nom. nud. (non Spreng, 1824). Evolvulus pilosus Roxb., Fl. Ind. 2: 106, 1832 (non C. pilosus Roxb., 1814, nec Wichstr. 1827). Convolvulus glomeratus Choisy ex DC. Prodr. 9: 401, 1845 (non Thunb. 1792). Ipomoea auricoma A. Rich. Tent. Fl. Abyss. 2: 67, 1851; Baker et Rendle in Dyer's Fl. Trop. Afr. 4(2): 94, 1905. Convolvulus arabicus Hochst. ex Hallier f. in Bot. Jahrb. 18: 100, 1894.

The earliest name of this species i.e., Convolvulus congestus R. Br., was published without description and is, therefore, a nom. nud. Evolvulus pilosus Roxb., the next available name, cannot be used in the genus Convolvulus, since it would result in a latter homonym of three different species i.e., C. pilosus R. Br. 1810 (=C. piliferus Steud.), C. pilosus Roxb. 1814 [=Ipomoea pilosa (Roxb.) Sweet] and also C. pilosus Wichstr. 1827 (=I. cissoides Griseb.). C. glomeratus Choisy ex DC. (1845), the next available name, is also a latter homonym of C. glomeratus Thunb. (1792) and C. glomeratus Wall. (=Argyrela cymosa Sweet) and is therefore an illegitimate name in the sense of the Code. Ipomoea auricoma A. Rich., which has doubtfully been given in the synonymy of C. glo-

meratus Choisy [in Fl. Trop. Afr. 4(2): 94, 1905] is certainly conspecific with the latter species. Thanks to the courtesy of the Director, Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, who sent me the photographs of the type sheets of *I. auricoma A.* Rich. The epithet 'auricomus', which is still unoccupied in the genus Convolvulus can, therefore, be used for this species and the correct name of the plant should bt C. auricomus (A. Rich.) Bhandari comb. nov.

Convolvulus auricomus var. volubilis (C. B. Clarke) Bhandari comb. nov. C. glomeratus var. volubilis (C. B. Clarke in Hook, f. Fl. Brit. Ind. 4: 219, 1883). (non C. volubilis Brouss. ex Link. = C. massoni Dietr.).

C. blatteri Bhandari nom. nov. C. densiflorus Blatt. & Hall. in J. Bombay nat. Hist. Soc. 26: 545, 1919 (Typolecto, Blatter, 3515, Amarsagar, Jaiselmer, Blatt.). (nom. illegit., non C. densiflorus Hook. & Arnot. 1827-28. = Ipomoea umbellata Linn.).

Blatter & Hallbergh's name is a latter homonym of Convolvulus densiflorus Hook. et Arnott (Bot. Beech. Voy. 303, 1827-28) and therefore illegitimate, to be neglected in accordance with the Code. Hooker and Arnott's plant is a synoynm of Ipomoea umbellata Linn. No other specific epithet has been published for the present species and hence a new name C. blatteri is proposed to commemorate the pioneering work which Fr. Blatter did in this difficult terrain.

Diplocyclos palmatus (Linn.) Jeffrey var. walkerii (Chakravarty) Bhandari et Singh comb. nov. Bryonopsis laciniosa (Linn.) Naud. var. walkerii Chakravarty in Rec. bot. Surv. India 17(1): 138, 1959.

This variety has so far been reported only from Ceylon by Chakravarty (loc. cit.); an examination of a large number of sheets of Bryonopsis laciniosa in Blatter Herbarium reveals that the plant is common in W. India. It has also been collected from Mt. Abu.

Dipteracanthus patulus (Jacq.) Nees var. alba (Saxton) Bhandari comb. nov. Ruellia patula Jacq. var. alba Saxton in Rec. bot. Surv. India 6: 288, 1918.

Cleome gynandra (Linn.) Briq. var. nana (Blatt. & Hall.) Bhandari comb. nov. Gynandropsis pentaphylla Linn. var. nana Blatt. & Hall. in J. Bombay nat. Hist. Soc. 26: 221, 1918.

Commiphora wightii (Arnott) Bhandari comb. nov. Balsemodendron wightii Arnott in Ann. Nat. Hist. Soc. 3: 86, 1839. B. roxburghii Stocks in Journ.

As. Soc. Bomb. 2: 391, 1848 (non Arnott, 1839). B. mukul Hook. ex Stocks in Hook. Kew Journ 1: 259, 1848. Balsamea mukul Baill. Hist. Pl. 5: 295, 1874-75. Commiphora mukul Engl. in DC. Mon. Phan. 4: 26, 1883. C. roxburghii (Stocks) Engler in Pfam. ed. 2, 19A: 436, 1931; Santapau Fl. Saur. 1: 86, 1962.

This species is well known under the name Commiphora mukul (Hook. ex Stocks) Engl. or Balsemodendron mukul Hook. ex Stocks (1849). Recently, however, it has been shown that B. roxburghii Stocks (1848) is an earlier name and hence Santapau (1962) has followed this nomenclature and the correct nomenclature of the plant is Commiphora roxburghii (Stocks) Engler. However, B. roxburghii Stocks (1848) is a latter homonym of B. roxburghii Arnott (1839). (=C. agallocha Engler). In accordance with article 64(2) which states "... even if the earlier homonym is illegitimate or is

generally treated as a synonym on taxonomical grounds, the latter homonym must be rejected", the epithet 'roxburghii' must not be used for this species. Even otherwise Balsemodendron wightii Arnott (1839) is the earliest validly published name of this taxon, and therefore it has priority over all other names and the plants should therefore be correctly named as C. wightii (Arnott) Bhandari comb. nov.

ACKNWOLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. U. N. Chatterji, Prof. of Botany, University of Jodhpur for his keen interest and the herbarium facilities. I am particularly grateful to Dr. B. Tiagi for his encouragement and valuable suggestions. To Fr. H. Santapau, Director, Botanical Survey of India, I am obliged, for his critically going through the manuscript.