J. Phytol. Res. 8 (2): 167-170, 1995

ALLELOPATHIC POTENTIAL OF CAESALPINIA CORIARIA (JACQ.) WILLD. ON PARTHENIUM HYSTEROPHORUS L.

M.JAYAKUMAR, M. EYINI* and M.MANIKANDAN

Research Department of Botany, VHNSN College, Virudhunagar-626 001, India. *Research Centre in Botany, Thiagarajar College (Autonomous), Madurai -625 009, India. The aqueous extract of fresh leaves of *Caesalpinia coriaria* (Jacq.) Willd. inhibited the growth of *Parthenium hysterophorus* L. The decrease in plant dry weight, shoot height, leaf area, total chlorophyll, and protein is proportional to the increase in concentration of leaf extract. The inhibitory effect was striking with nearly complete mortality in higher (15% and 20%) concentrations. The results suggest that the higher content (40 mg/ g Fr.wt.) of tannins in *C.coriaria* leaves might be responsible for the allelopathic effect. Keywords: Allelopathy, *Caesalpinia coriaria, Parthenium hysterophorus*; Tannin.

Plants produce many compounds that have no apparent metabolic or physiologic role for the producer. These secondary metabolites often have effects on other organisms. They are believed to function as allelochemicals.^{1,2} Parthenium hysterophorus L. a common and serious weed has spread to almost all parts of the country. Its possible allelopathic potential on crop lants have been observed by many scientists.³⁻⁵ Phenolic compounds produced by teak leaf⁶, bamboo root⁷, bamboo leaf⁸ and eucalyptus leaf⁹ are inhibitory to seedling growth of groundnut and corn. Tannins are the another group of allelochemicals produced by plants showing inhibitory effect¹⁰. Caesalpinia coriaria (jacq.) Willd. (vi divi) is a small tree, which is common in our place. It was observed that no plant was growing around the divi divi trees. This effect may be due to the presence of higher content of tannins in divi divi leaves. Currently much interest exists in eleminating the deadly weed Parthenium. Therefore the present investigations were conducted to study the effect of aqueous extract of C.coriaria on P.hysterophorus seedlings.

Uniform size (30 days old) *P.* hysterophorus seedlings were selected from our College campus and transplanted to polythene bags of diameter 10 cm containing black alluvial soil mixed with farmyard manure in the ratio 1:4. The plants were maintained under normal photoperiod 12 ± 2 h and temperature ($28 \pm 2^{\circ}$ C).

Fresh C.coriaria (divi divi) leaves were collected from 2 yr cld tree. 10 gm of leaves were extracted with 100 ml of distilled water in a Wareing blender and concentrated on a water bath, diluted in the ratio of 1:5, 1:10, 1:15, and 1:20 with distilled water. 50 ml/bag of the extract was used for irrigation from the day of transplantation at an interval of 3 days. The plants irrigated with water alone were considered as control. The analyses were being made at an interval of 10 days from the 10th day after transplantation (40th day) to the day of complete death of plants in 20% treatment (70th day). Third leaf of each seedling was used for the experiments.

The plant dry weight, shoot length, mortality rate, leaf area (measured using the

1				A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL			Change 10			
		Plant dry weight	(mg/g)	1 4 4	204	Control	Sincot le	ngun (cm) 10%	15%	20%
ays	Control	5.6	60 J	LUS	40.2	16.2	15.5	13.2	10.5	0.6
	65.0	c.00	c.cc		; +	,#	+	+	+	H
	4 4 50 50	H S	()) H :	4 Y Y	0.50	15.	1.5	11	91	2
	5.50	2:00	4.41	55.3	227	17.9	16.6	14.5	12.0	10.9
_	C.60	C .00	t +	: + }	+	H	+	+	H	+ 1 ;
	+ ;	ΗY	375	372	3.51	2.0	0.5	12	13	0.5
		4.12	659	61.3	56.9	19.1	17.9	16.0	14.2	171
	1	. +	+	+	Ŧ	(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	++	Ħ	H	H
	H	4 2 4 2	675	422	3.41	1.0	1.3	1.0	6.0	1.1
		017	505	545	50.4	18.5	17.0	15.5	14.0	0.21
	1.01	4.00	+	+	Ŧ	#	Ħ	+ (1) (2)	H (H
	H Ç	5 50 1	6.21	5.41	3.91	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.0	0.1
eedling		tita dire a in in in in in in in in in in in in in	*(Valu	ies are ± SE o	of 5 samples e	xpressed in Cm ²)		()		
	ALL AND	Mortality rat	e (%)				Leal			ave
		Kall Kall	100	1596	20%	Control	5%	10%	04.01	53
ays	Control	94.0	a or	0	20	6:39	6.10	6.00	5.91	5.7
9	0						2 1 10 10 10 10 10	Ŧ	Ħ	
					al A	0.65	0.59	0.50	• 0.45	0.5
	10 10 m			00	20	9.45	9.15	7.95	6.54	63
0	0.000	0	>	2			+	#	+	
						0.95	0.65	0.80	0.51	0.5
				40	40	12.80	12.00	10.85	8.45	8.0
20		0 0 3 0	8	2				+	+	
	121 212 212					06.0	1.00	0.89	0.81	1.0
			ų	80	80	13.50	12.95	11.75	11.40	0.11
20	0		7				Ŧ	H	++	The second
		and the second se				200	1 66	110	1 10	Ċ

Jayakumar et. al.

168

Sn	
ohoi	N.C.
tero	
sky	10
f P.	
nto	
onte	
oin c	
rote	1999
nd p	S
ylla	~
udo.	
hlor	
tal c	
on to	
ria (
oria	
0.0	
s of	
eave	
sh l	
f fre	
act c	. Here
extr	
ater	
ofw	
ect	
.Eff	S
ole 3	ling
Tat	seed

Days Cont 40 0<		otal chloroph	yll (mg/g)		The second		10 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 -	Prote	(g/gm) nic		
40 00 50 00 60 00 70 0 7 70 0 7 Table 4. Effer 8 seedlings. 1 40 15 10	trol	5%	10%		15%	20%	Control	5%	10%	15%	20%
50 00 60 00 70 00 71 Table 4. Effer seedlings. 1 1	.31	0.29	0.27		0.24	0.22	50.75	49.50	<u>> 47.41</u>	44.35	40.55
50 50 00 60 60 0 70 0 0 71 able 4. Effer seedlings. 1	+I	Ŧ	+		+I	+I	++	+	+	+	+1
50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	.02	0.01	0.02		0.01	0.02	3.00	2.50	4.71	4.51	4.21
60 00 70 0 0 71 Table 4. Effect seedlings. 0 10 40 15 1	39	0.31	0.30		0.26	0.23	55.05	52.57	50.52	48.37	46.65
60 00 70 00 71 Effet Table 4. Effet seedlings. 40 15 40 15	+I	H	++		H	H	Ŧ	+I	++	+	+1
60 0 0 70 0 0 Table 4. Effet seedlings. 40 15 1	.03	0.01	0.02		0.03	0.01	2.75	2.00	4.50	4.00	3.51
70 0 Table 4. Effer seedlings. 40 15 1	.46	0.38	0.35		0.29	0.25	60.76	57.54	54.32	50.59	48.57
0 70 0 1 Table 4. Effect seedlings. 40 15 1	+I	H	H		+I	÷	+1	+ı	Ħ	Ŧ	+
70 0 Table 4. Effect seedlings. Days Con 1	03	0.03	0.03		0.02	0.01	6.00	5.15	5.01	3.25	4.21
0 Table 4. Effec seedlings. 40 15 1	.45	0.37	0:30		0.27	0.23	57.51	55.91	52.75	49.50	47.09
0 Table 4. Effected seedlings. Days Com 40 15	+I	H	+		+I	H	H	Ħ	++	+I	++
Table 4. Effected ings. Days Com	.03	0.04	0.02		0.03	0.02	5.90	5.00	3.95	2.59	3.50
Days Coni 40 15		ICI CYUACI			2	Intaria On	ammo aciu :	ind proune	content of	r. nyster	smoude
Days Cont 40 15 1		Amino acid	(mg/g)		- 33			Proli	ne (mg/g)	100	
40 15	rol	5%	10%		15%	20%	Control	5%	10%	15%	20%
-	- 56	14.21	13.00		1.95	10.51	5.60	5.75	6.36	7.52	8.95
	Ŧ	+I	+1		H	Ŧ	+	+	H	Ħ	+
	8	1.10	1.00		1.20	0.85	0.50	0.50	0.54	0.60	0.71
50 17	.80	16.35	15.45		3.41	12.35	7.50	7.95	8.04	9.05	6.60
	+1	+I	+		+I	+	++	Ŧ	+	+	+
-	.05	1.00	1.25		1.00	06.0	09.0	0.45	0.70	0.85	0.89
60 19	50	18.51	16.95	-	5.12	13.18	9.10	8.60	8.90	9.25	10.00
	+I	H	H		+ı	H	н н хи	+	+ı	Ħ	+
1	.75	1.75	1.51		1.50	1.20	0.65	0.75	0.65	0.69	1.00
70 18	45	17.59	16.06		5.00	13.01	8.55	7.96	7.11	7.05	6.70
	÷	H	H		+1	Ħ	+	+	H C	H	+
1	70	1.70	1.50		0.95	1.41	0.80	0.72	0.75	0.70	0.57

J. Phytol. Res. 8 (2), 1995

169

ľ.

automatic area meter Model AAM-7), total chlorophyll¹¹, protein¹², amino acid¹³ and proline¹⁴ were studied. Tannin content¹⁵ was estimated in the leaves of 70th day plants. The experiment was replicated 5 times in completely randamised design and SE values were determined¹⁶.

Tannin content in divi divi leaves was 40 mg/g Fr.wt. and significant reductions in plant dry weight, shoot length, mortality rate and leaf area of P.hysterophorus were observed as the concentration of C.coriaria leaf extract increased (Table 1 & 2). This reduction indicates that the aqueous extracts contained growth inhibiting allelopathic substances and that the effect of the extract was concentration dependent. This result is in agreement with earlier studies^{17,18}. A decrease in total chlorophyll, protein, amino acid content and increase in proline content were also observed (Table 3 & 4). Similar inhibition was reported from aqueous extracts of teak leaf, bamboo root, bamboo leaf and eucalyptus leaves on groundnut and corn due to water soluble inhibitors in the extracts^{6,10}. It is inferred that the inhibition in growth. decrease in total chlorophyll, protein, amino acid contents and increase in proline content of P.hysterophorus leaves by C.coriaria leaf extract might be partly due to the inhibitory effect of tannins.

References

- 1 Bell LS 1981 in The biochemistry of plants Academic Press, New York (Ed) E E Conn, 1-7
- 2. Rice EL 1984, *Allelopathy* Academic Press, New York, 2nd Ed
- 3. Dube VP, Singhal VP and Tyagi S 1979 Bot. Prog. 2 62
- 4. Kanchan S and Jayachandra 1980, New Phytol. 84 739
- 5. Mersic W and Singh M 1988, Weed Sci 36 278
- 6. Jayakumar M, Eyini M and Pannirselvam S 1987a, Geobios 14 66
- 7. Jayakumar M, Eyini M and Pannirselvam S 1987b, Geobios 14 221
- 8. Eyini M, Jayakumar M and Pannirselvam S 1989, Trop. Ecol. 30 138
- 9. Jayakumar M, Eyini M and Pannirselvam S 1990, Comp. Physiol and Eco15 109
- 10. Rice EL and Pancholy SK 1973, Amer. J. Bot.60 691
- 11. Arnon DI 1949, Plant Physiol24 1
- 12. Lowry OH, Rosebrough NJ, Farr AL and Randall RJ 1951, J. Bioe. Chem. 193 265.
- 13. Moore S and Stein W 1948, J. Biol. Chem. 176 367
- 14. Bates LS, Waldren RP and Teare ID 1973, Plant Soil 39 205
- 15. Schander! SH 1970, Method in food analysis, Academic press, Newyork.
- Gomez KA and Gomez AA 1984, Statistical procedures for agricultural research, A Wiley Interscience publication, Newyork, 2nd Ed.
- 17. Pardales JR Jr and Dingal AG 1988, Trop. Agri.65 21
- 18. Pardales JR Jr, Kono Y, Yamauchi A and Hajima M 1992, Ann. Bot. 69 493