Note on the Identity of *Ipomoea Koloaensis* Leveille (Convolvulaceae)

Daniel F. Austin

During recent study of the Convolvulaceae for the *Manual of the Flowering Plants of Hawaii* (W. L. Wagner, D. R. Herbst, and S. H. Sohmer, in prep.) a need was found to identify some of the names Leveille published early this century. Hector Leveille described two species of *Ipomoea* in 1911 (Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg. 10: 154. 1911). As with many of the binomials proposed by Leveille, the names represent species with long-established epithets. Joseph Rock discussed the identity of these two Convolvulaceae along with other families in his caustic article three years later (Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg. 13: 352–359. 1914). Rock identified *Ipomoea fauriei* H. Leveille as perhaps a depauperate specimen of *Ipomoea pes-caprae* (Linnaeus) R. Brown, and that fits the protologue. For reasons that remain unknown, Rock identified *Ipomoea koloensis* H. Leveille as *Ipomoea acetasaeolia* Roemer and Schultes. We now know that the proper name of the species to which Rock ascribed Leveille’s binomial is *Ipomoea imperati* (Vahl) Grisebach (cf. LaValva and Sabato, Taxon 32: 114. 1983). Later Lauener (Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. 37: 146. 1978; 41: 363. 1983) accepted the identification by Rock without comment. Lauener (1978) did note that he had not seen the type of the Leveille epithet. Since the original set of Faurie collections, on which the name was based, is not deposited at Edinburgh (I. C. Hedge, personal communication, 1985), the set’s location has been unknown. Duplicate sets of the Faurie collections reside in Paris (P), Bishop Museum (BISH), the Arnold Arboretum (A), and British Museum (BM).

There is no specimen of the type collection (Faurie 1036) in Edinburgh. I could not find one in Honolulu (BISH); my colleague G. Staples did not find one at the Arnold Arboretum (A), and Lauener (Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinb. 38: 495–497. 1980) did not locate a specimen in British Museum (BM). The sheet in Paris bears the correct number but not the Leveille name. Moreover, the specimen in Paris is not *Ipomoea imperati*.

Perusal of the protologue, and the availability of only one herbarium sheet, lead one to believe that the sheet in Paris is the type in spite of the fact that it was not so annotated by Leveille. The original description reads: “Caules valde intricati, colore paleaceo, glabri et filiformes; folia violaeformia, longe petiolata; petiolo limbum subaequante; capsula paleacea globosa; sepala ovata acuta brunea, margine scariosa. Kauai: Koloa, dec. 1909 (Faurie, 1036).” Few people would take this to be *Ipomoea imperati* and the reason Rock called it that species remains a mystery. The description, although brief, contains several comments that point toward *Ipomoea obscura* (Linnaeus) Ker-Gawler. The “folia violaeformia,” for example, are the cordate leaves of *I. obscura*. Similarly, the description of the sepals and fruit suggest *I. obscura*. An alternate possibility would be *Ipomoea ochracea* (Lindley) G. Don, but as far as is known that species was first collected on Oahu in 1975. To further indicate that *I. obscura* is the correct species, the specimen in Paris is clearly that taxon.

It seems that the conclusion to be drawn is reasonably clear. Both Rock (1911) and Lauener (1978) were wrong in their identification of *I. Koloaensis*. The protologue points convincingly to *I. obscura*, and the specimen in Paris supports this contention. I propose to typify the Leveille epithet with the Paris specimen. Even if a duplicate of Faurie 1036 should be found that is *I. imperati*, the protologue argues against using it as the type. The following typification will establish the identity of the name for future reference.
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