

atum Lour. (Fl. Cochinch. 497, 1790; ed. Willd. 608, 1793). Interestingly, Randeria (Blumea 10: 298, 1960) placed *Blumea sinuata* (Lour.) Merr. in a category "Taxa and Names of uncertain status"; and thus did not recognise Merrill's combination although he had reduced *Blumea laciniata* (Roxb.) DC. to the rank of a synonym of his combination—*Blumea sinuata* (Lour.) Merr. Further, Merrill (*loc. cit.*) added "Loureiro's concise description [of *Gnaphalium sinuatum*, the basionym of *Blumea sinuata*]* applies unmistakably to the common and widely distributed species of *Blumea* currently known as *B. laciniata* DC. which is apparently fairly common in Indochina and which occurs at the (P. Conduc.), Loureiro's classical locality".

From the above statements, it is evident that the binomial accepted by Randeria (*loc. cit.*)—*Blumea laciniata* (Roxb.) DC. is conspecific with *Blumea sinuata* (Lour.) Merr. The latter combination—*Blumea sin-*

uata (Lour.) Merr.—thus does have a definite status; and since it antedates *B. laciniata* (Roxb.) DC., it should, according to the ICBN, be accepted as the correct and legitimate name of the plant. The synonymy would be as follows:

Blumea sinuata (Lour.) Merr. Trans. Amer. Philosoph. Soc. 24: 388, 1935.

Gnaphalium sinuatum Lour. Fl. Cochinch. 497, 1790; ed. Willd. 608, 1793.

Blumea laciniata (Roxb.) DC. Prodr. 5: 436, 1836; Randeria, Blumea 10: 258, 1960.

Conyza laciniata Roxb. Hort. Beng. 61. 1814, *n.n.*; Fl. Ind. ed. 2, 3: 427, 1832.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The facilities extended by The Director, Botanical Survey of India, for consulting the Library are greatly appreciated. Sincere thanks are expressed to Drs. K.M.M. Dakshini and C. R. Babu for valuable discussions.

PRITHIPAL SINGH

Deshabandhu College, New Delhi

*Emphasis in parenthesis added

ON THE IDENTITY OF *BORRERIA ERADII* RAVI (RUBIACEAE)

Borreria eradii was proposed by Ravi in Journ. Bombay nat. Hist. Soc. 66 (3): 539. 1970, on the basis of a gathering collected in 1968 from Punalur, Kerala State. He distinguished this species from the closely allied *B. hispida* (L.) K. Schum. (= *Spermacoce hispida* L.) for (1) prominently winged quadrangular stems, (2) soft textured leaves with impressed veins, (3) apically papillate stipular bristles bearing long multicellular hairs with bulbous base and interspersed with glandular papillae, (4) fugaceous funnel-shaped corolla with a narrow tube abruptly widening into a swollen mouth and (5) the fruit with the lower part of the septum only

remaining persistent after dehiscence. He observed further that this species is intermediate between *B. hispida* (L.) K. Schum. and *B. ocymoides* Burm. f. in dehiscence of the fruit and resembles *B. stricta* (L. f.) K. Schum. (= *Spermacoce pusilla* Wall.) in the soft textured leaves with impressed veins. In dehiscence, however, this is more akin to *B. ocymoides* than to *B. hispida*.

While checking the identification of *S. hispida* in the Forest Herbarium, Dehra Dun, Nathani & Raizada determined four specimens as *B. eradii* and thereby recorded in *Indian Forester* 102 (10): 682. 1976, its extended distribution to North Bengal, Tripura and Burma.

Ravi correctly distinguished his gathering

from *B. hispida* with which it is confused in Indian herbaria, as is evidently observed by Nathani & Raizada (l.c.). But he does not appear to have consulted any large herbarium to ascertain the taxonomic status of his collection as there is no such acknowledgement recorded in his paper. In that event he might have known that such a plant occurs not only in Kerala but also in many other places.

In course of a taxonomic study of *Spermacoce* sensu lato, taken up recently for the revised Flora of India by the Botanical Survey of India, we sorted out some specimens from the gatherings of *S. hispida*, extant in the Central National Herbarium, Calcutta, and determined them as *S. latifolia* Aubl. At the same time these agreed with the isotype of *B. eradii* (Ravi 2372 B-D) and the description thereof. It is interesting to note here that we determined K. Biswas 9436 in CAL collected from Kalimpong as *S. latifolia* while a gathering collected from the same place by the same collector, which is extant in the Forest Herbarium, Dehra Dun, is treated by Nathani & Raizada (l.c.) as *B. eradii*. Thus *B. eradii* is superfluous and is reduced here to a synonym of *S. latifolia*.

Yamazaki in Hara, Fl. E. Himal. 307. 1966, reported *B. latifolia* with citation of specimens from Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. Of those, a duplicate of one collected from E. Nepal, Dhara Pani-Ilam, 1200-1500 m, Dec. 5, 1963, H. Hara et al. s.n. is extant in herb. CAL. All the specimens (Subba Rao 136, Thothathri 10323 & Sengupta 863) cited as *B. articularis* by Mukerjee in Mat Fl. Bhutan 11.6.1973, and extant in herb. CAL represent *S. latifolia*. Likewise other specimens collected from Bhutan, Sikkim, North Bengal, Assam and Meghalaya within the species covers of *B. hispida* or its synonyms in CAL and some of the specimens sent on loan from herb. ASSAM are now determined as *B. latifolia*.

It is a native of South America from Central America to Bolivia and West Indies but now a common casual in many parts of the world including Tropical East Africa, India, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Burma, Malay Peninsula, Java and Australia (Verdcourt 1976).

Spermacoce latifolia Aubl., Hist. Pl. Guiane Fr. 55. t. 1911. 1775 (Type: French Guiana, Cayenne, etc., Aublet ? P, holo. the senior author could not trace it out there); DC. Prodr. 4: 558. 1830; Verdcourt, in Fl. Trop. E. Afr. (Rubiaceae) 364. 1976.

Borreria latifolia (Aubl.) K. Schum. in Mart. Fl. Bras. 6(6): 61. 1888; Ridley, Fl. Malay Pen. 2: 175. 1923; Bremek. in Pulle, Fl. Suriname 4: 291. 1934; Hepper, Fl. West Trop. Afr. ed. 2, 2: 219. 1963.

B. articularis Mukerjee in Rec. bot. Surv. Ind'a 20 (2): 116. 1973, non K. Schum.

B. eradii Ravi in Journ. Bombay nat. Hist. Soc. 66 (3): 539. t. 1. f. 1-10. 1970 (Type: Kerala State, Punalur, 20.6.1968, N. Ravi 2372 B-D, iso., CAL!); Nathani & Raizada in Indian Forester 102 (10): 682. 1976, synon. nov.

The distribution in India is much more extensive than that is reported by Nathani & Raizada (l.c.). We have so far examined collections from Kerala, North Bengal (Jalpaiguri, Kalimpong), Sikkim, Assam and Meghalaya.

D. B. DEB AND (MRS.) R. DUTTA

Botanical Survey of India, Howrah

REFERENCE

- MUKERJEE, S. K. Materials for the Flora of Bhutan. *Rec. bot. Surv. India* 20 (2): 116. 1973.
NATHANI, H. B. AND M. B. RAIZADA. New distribution records of Eleven plants in India. *Indian Forester*. 102 (10): 675-691. 1976.
RAVI, N. A new species of *Borreria* Mey. from South India. *J. Bombay nat. Hist. Soc.* 66(3): 539-541. 1970.
VERDCOURT, B. Rubiaceae (Part 1). *Flora of Tropical East Africa*, Crown Agents for Oversea governments and Administration, London and Tonbridge. 1976.
YAMAZAKI, T. In H. Hara, *Flora of Eastern Himalaya*, p. 307. University Press, Tokyo. 1966.