Table 1. Yield of and returns from pigeonpeas grown on an Alfisol with three irrigation treatments and six spacings at Hyderabad, A.P., India in 1979 and 1980.

T	- <del>7 ' <u>-</u> . 7. <u> </u></del>	Seed	yield (k	g/ha)	Cost of culti-	Net profit
Treatment		1979	1980	Mean	vation (Rs/ha)	Net profit (Rs/ha)a
Irrigation	levels					
Two irrigat	ions	815	734	775	2008	705
Three irrig	ations	966	1095	1031	2068	1541
Four irriga	tions	1219	1127	1173	2106	2000
CD (5%)		68	168			
SE +		20	49			
Plant spacing	Plants/m <sup>2</sup>					
30 x 10 cm	33	1172	1116	1144	2106	1898
45 x 10 cm	22	1132	1116	1124	2056	1878
30 x 20 cm	17	9 7 9	1045	1012	2057	1485
60 x 10 cm	17	994	986	990	2056	1409
45 x 20 cm	11	886	917	902	2007	1150
60 x 20 cm	8	835	735	785	1982	766
CD (5%)		40	71			
SE <u>+</u>		14	25			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Price of pigeonpea Rs 3.50 per kg; One U.S. dollar approximately equals Rs 9.00.

the postrainy season in our part of peninsular India.

- Mohd. Ikramullah and Y. Yogeswara Rao (Andhra Pradesh Agricultural University, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, A.P., India)

## Does Soil Cracking Reduce Pigeonpea Yields?

At Hyderabad, India, medium-duration pigeonpea cultivars planted at the normal time, in June or July with the onset of the monsoon, enter their reproductive phase after the cessation of the rains in September or October and mature around December. They are then usually harvested by cutting the plant at ground level. However, if pods are picked from the plants (Sheldrake and Narayanan 1979), or if the plants are ratooned (Sharma et al. 1978), they go on to produce a second flush of pods, which matures around March.

In the absence of irrigation, the development of the second flush depends on the use of moisture stored within the soil. We have compared the second harvest yields of unirrigated pigeonpeas on red soils (Alfisols) and on deep black soils (Vertisols). The latter have a considerably higher waterholding capacity than the former. We therefore expected the second harvest yields to be greater on Vertisols than Alfisols. Over a period of 5 years, however, we have found that without exception the reverse was true

(Table 1). Over this period, the average first harvest yields were almost the same on both soil types, but second harvest yields were over three times higher on the Alfisols.

We have been unable to explain these surprising results in terms of nutrient or micronutrient deficiencies on Vertisols, nor can they be accounted for in terms of differential disease or pest attack on the two soil types.

We now think that the relatively low second harvest yields on Vertisols may be due to the deep cracks that develop in these soils as the dry season advances. Besides providing a ready avenue for the loss of soil moisture, soil cracking causes exten-

Year Cultivar (kg/ha) (kg/ha) (kg/ha) (kg/ha) (kg/ha) (hean) 1234 (hean) 1234 (hean) 1581 1 1978-79 (hean) 1979-80 (hean) 1979-80 (hean) 1980-81 (hean) 1980-81 (hean) (kg/ha)	Table 1.	First and second harvest yields different years on Alfisol and Vation. The first harvest yield at normal time of harvest in Decin March.	err err err	medium-duration tisol at ICRISAT were collected b ser. The second	pigeonp Center y pickin harvest	eas grown in without irri- g the pods was taken
No.148 and AS-71-37 (mean) 1234 BDN 1 1581 BDN 1 130 BDN 1 699	ear	Cultivar		vest yield /ha) Vertisol	Second harves (kg/ha)	harvest yield kg/ha) Vertisol
B DN 1 1581 130 B DN 1 1315 699	976-77	No.148 and AS-71-37 (mean)	1234	689	02	339
B DN 1 130 1315 1315 B DN 1 699	977-78	<del> </del>	1581	1769	704	337
B DN 1 899	978-79	B DN 1	1130	1607	531	152
B DN 1	9.79-80	B DN 1	1315	1102	253	26
	980-81	B DN 1	669	069	785	82
1192	ean		1192	1171	629	194

sive damage to roots, many of which are stretched or ruptured as the cracks widen. Such cracks do not appear in Alfisols.

Observations on chickpeas grown at ICRISAT Center on Vertisols during the postrainy season also suggest that soil cracking leads to yield reductions; indeed this may be a general phenomenon in crops grown on cracking soils.

We are at present conducting experiments to test the hypothesis that the rupturing of the roots is a major factor in reducing yields on cracking soils.

## References

SHARMA, D., SAXENA, K.B., and GREEN, J.M. 1978. Potential of ratooning in pigeonpea. Field Crops Research 1: 165-172.

SHELDRAKE, A.R., and NARAYANAN, A. 1979. Growth, development and nutrient uptake in pigeonpeas (Cajanus cajan). Journal of Agricultural Science (Cambridge) 92: 513-526.

- A.R. Sheldrake and N. Venkataratnam (ICRISAT)

## Response to Irrigation in Postrainy-Season Pigeonpea

In India, pigeonpea is traditionally grown as a rainy-season crop. Reports on pigeonpea as a postrainy crop appeared in the literature as early as 1908. In recent years it has again been demonstrated that pigeonpea can be grown as a successful postrainy-season crop in areas where winter temperatures are relatively mild.

Crop growth and per plant yield of postrainy season pigeonpea are drastically reduced because of their sensitivity to the short days at that time. To compensate for the reduced growth, it is necessary to increase the plant density from around 4 plants/m² in rainy season to 33 plants/m² and above in the postrainy season. Even then, the yields are low because the crop must grow only on the moisture stored in the soil profile from the preceding rainy season. This moisture recedes as the crop growth proceeds. In areas, however, where the water table is high or winter rains are good, the yields may be equal to that of a rainy-season crop. Water