about close-up photography, a fine book to read is Basic Guide to Close-up PhotographY (HP Books). There is also a good article on inexpensive lighting tricks, even for use in the field, called Low-Tech Macro Lighting in the April 1990 issue of PHOTOgraphic Magazine (a U.S. based magazine that may be archived at your local library). I am also willing to discuss further macrophotography hints and troubleshooting with other growers-my address is in the 1989 ICPS directory.

More On The Evolution Of Drosera

By John D. Degreef (6 rue Libotte; B-4020 LIEGE; BELGIUM)

Professor S.E. Williams has kindly drawn my attention to a pollen study by TAKAHASHI & SOHMA (1982), which contains valuable information on the evolution of the genus Drosera. Results can be summarized as follows:

1. The primitive sections Psychophila (D. uniflora, D. arcturi, D. stenopetala) and Drosera are closely related.

2. Some sections still clearly show that they derive from these:

-the African section Ptycnostigma (D. cistiflora e.a.)

-the sundews from the mildest regions of Australia: d. hamiltonii, section Arachnopus (D. indica, D. adelae...), and to a certain extent, D. banksii. The link between section **Drosera** and *D. hamiltonii* is rather surprising condidering the floral differences. Yet the presence of the naphtoquinone plumbagin in this now appears less strange. The fact that a primitive member of the subgenus Ergaleium, D. banksii has pollen resembling that of section **Drosera**, is extremely important information. It confirms that the modern tropical or subtropical tuberous sundews can indeed be descendants of Antarctic immigrants.

3. There are definite links between the advanced Australian Drosera:

-the close relation between the tuber-producing sections Erythrorrhiza

and Ergaleium is confirmed.

-these two are relatives of section Phycopsis (D. binata), section Lamprolepis (pygmies), D. pygmaea, and quite surprisingly, D. petiolaris. Until now the latter was considered as a very close recelative of section Drosera, not as intermediate between this group and subgenus Ergaleium!

4. There were faint indications that D. glanduligera was related to the tuberous sundews. This study shows an affinity with section Thelocalyx (D. burmanni) instead! This section does not appear to be close to section Drosera. D. glanduligera is much more different from the South American member of this group, D sessilifolia, than D. burmanni. So we have to allow for a much longer evolution, and the migration of these plants to Australia need not be as recent as hypothesized earlier.

5. D. regia appears not to be related to any known section. Its pollen somewhat resembles that of... Dionaea! This is very important information, for we may have found the last palynological link between the modern Drosera and the archaic Fischeripollis, from which the sundews (and the Venus' Flytrap) may descend! The rather primitive flower of D. regia does not oppose this interpretation.

6. There are may abnormal pollen grains in some plants of D. binata. This con-

firms the heteroploid nature of this species.

Source:

TAKAHISHI, Hideki & SOHMA, Kankichi. (1982). Pollen morphology of the Droseraceae and its related taxa. Sci. Rep. Tohoku Univ., 4th ser., Biology Vol. 38:81-156.