

Ateneo de Manila University

Archium Ateneo

Biology Faculty Publications

Biology Department

4-17-2021

(2808) Proposal to Reject the Name *Acalypha supera* (Euphorbiaceae)

Geoffrey A. Levin

Vernie G. Sagun

Follow this and additional works at: <https://archium.ateneo.edu/biology-faculty-pubs>



Part of the [Biology Commons](#), and the [Plant Sciences Commons](#)

it is diagnostic of *A. wilkesiana*. The description of *A. tricolor* presumably was based on a living plant as it was in a report of new plants at the “Exhibition of Flowers [...] on Tuesday last at South Kensington”, and no type has been designated previously. However, there is a specimen of *A. wilkesiana* with variegated leaves (faded, but apparently green and red) in K (stamped “Herbarium Hookerianum 1867”) that bears a handwritten label saying “‘*Acalypha tricolor*’ Hort. [...] Hort. Veitch”, apparently indicating it was grown by Veitch; the label also suggests that the specimen is from a plant collected by Veitch in the New Hebrides (now Vanuatu) in July 1844. There apparently being no original material for the name, the K specimen is here designated as the neotype. Because that issue of *The Gardeners’ Chronicle* was published on 26 May 1866, about three months before Müller’s work appeared, *A. tricolor* Veitch ex Mast. is a validly published, older name for *A. wilkesiana*.

The name *Acalypha wilkesiana* or its synonym *A. amentacea* Roxb. subsp. *wilkesiana* (Müll. Arg.) Fosberg (in *Smithsonian Contr.*

Bot. 45: 10. 1980) have been consistently used for this well-known and horticulturally important species since 1866 (cf. publication lists at Govaerts & al., l.c.; Plants of the World Online, <http://powo.science.kew.org>), whereas *A. tricolor* has never been accepted, although ‘tricolor’ is sometimes used as a cultivar name. In the interest of nomenclatural stability, we propose conserving the name *Acalypha wilkesiana* Müll. Arg. against *A. tricolor* Veitch ex Mast.

Author information

GAL, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1514-1570>

VGS, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5348-0648>

Acknowledgements

We thank David Mabberley for calling our attention to his paper, cited above. We are grateful to John McNeill and John Wiersema for their editorial comments. Lynn Gillespie provided valuable comments on an early version of the paper.

(2808) Proposal to reject the name *Acalypha supera* (Euphorbiaceae)

Geoffrey A. Levin¹  & Vernie G. Sagun² 

¹ *Illinois Natural History Survey, Prairie Research Institute, University of Illinois, 1816 S Oak St., Champaign, Illinois 61820, U.S.A.; Canadian Museum of Nature, P.O. Box 3443 Station “D”, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6P4, Canada*

² *Department of Biology, Ateneo de Manila University, Loyola Heights, Quezon City 1108, Philippines*

Address for correspondence: *Geoffrey A. Levin, levin1@illinois.edu*

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12483>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2808) *Acalypha supera* Forssk., *Fl. Aegypt.-Arab.*: 162. 1 Oct 1775
[*Angiosp.: Euphorb.*], nom. utique rej. prop.
Typus: non designatus.

The name *Acalypha supera* was established by Forsskål (Fl. Aegypt.-Arab.: 162. 1775) by means of a short description. In the protologue, he noted that his new species resembled *A. indica* L. (Sp. Pl.: 1003. 1753) but lacked bracts, which he suggested might have fallen off. Forsskål’s notes indicate that he saw the plant in Yemen, but unfortunately he did not designate a type, and no potential type material has been found in the Forsskål Herbarium at C or elsewhere, and no one has ever reported seeing any original material (Christensen in *Dansk Bot. Ark.* 4: 28. 1922; Hepper & Friis, *Pl. Forsskål’s Fl. Aegypt.-Arab.*: 152. 1994).

Poiret (in Lamarck, *Encycl.* 6: 207. 1804) discussed the status of *Acalypha supera*, stating that he believed it to be *A. indica* except for the absence of female bracts, but that seeing a specimen would be necessary to confirm its identity. Steudel (*Nomencl. Bot.* 1: 4. 1821; ed. 2, 1: 10. 1840) merely noted Poiret’s uncertain treatment. Müller (in *Linnaea* 34: 45. 1865; in *Candolle, Prodr.* 15(2): 870. 1866) tentatively synonymized it with *A. brachystachya* Hornem. (*Enum. Pl. Hort. Hafn., rev. ed.*: 1. 1807), writing in his latter work, “Hic etiam pertinere videtur *A. supera* Forsk.” The few other botanists who mentioned *A. supera* over the succeeding 134 years (Schweinfurth in *Bull. Herb.*

Boissier 7, App. II: 309. 1899; Christensen, l.c.; Pax & Hoffmann in *Engler, Pflanzenr.* IV. 147 XVI (Heft 65): 101. 1924; Schwartz, *Fl. Trop. Arab.*: 138. 1939; Hepper & Friis, l.c.; Govaerts, *World Checkl. Seed Pl.* 1(1): 42, 1(2): 47. 1995) followed Müller’s lead, usually indicating equal uncertainty. Only in 2000 was it first accepted, without explanation, as the correct name for the species previously called *A. brachystachya* (Govaerts & al., *World Checkl. Euphorb.* 1: 90. 2000).

Since 2000, *Acalypha supera* has been accepted as the name for this species in a few subcontinental or national floras and checklists, such as Lebrun & Stork (*Fl. Pl. Trop. Africa* 2: 24. 2006), Sosef & al. (in *Scripta Bot. Belg.* 35: 58. 2006); Figueiredo & Smith (in *Strelitzia* 22: 70. 2008), Qiu & Gilbert (in *Wu & al., Fl. China* 11: 252. 2008), and Pickering & Darbyshire (in *Darbyshire & al., Pl. Sudan S. Sudan*: 216. 2015). During the same period, the name *A. brachystachya* has been used for this taxon in the following subcontinental or national floras and checklists: Boufford & al. (in *Huang & al., Fl. Taiwan*, ed. 2, 6: 68. 2003), Ngernsaengsaruy & Chayamarit (in *Santisuk & Larsen, Fl. Thailand* 8: 23. 2005), Klopper & al. (*Checkl. Fl. Pl. Sub-Saharan Africa*: 274. 2006), Balakrishnan & Chakrabarty (*Fam. Euphorb. India*: 24. 2007), Sagun & al. (in *Blumea* 55: 35. 2010), Barberá & al. (in *Phytotaxa* 140: 3. 2013), and Cardiel & Montero Muñoz (in *Pl. Syst. Evol.* 304: 99. 2017); it has also been used in multiple checklists for smaller areas (for examples, see list in Govaerts

& al., World Checkl. Euphorb., <https://wmsp.science.kew.org>). It is also notable that several online nomenclatural databases (Govaerts & al., l.c., accessed 18 Jan 2021; Plants of the World Online, <http://powo.science.kew.org>, accessed 18 Jan 2021; and checklists based on these) accept *A. brachystachya*, although admittedly this almost certainly reflects our note (Sagun & al., l.c.) that we would be proposing rejection of *A. supera*.

Forsskål's description of *Acalypha supera* is, in our opinion, not diagnostic, a view also shared by Balakrishnan & Chakrabarty (l.c.) and Cardiel & Montero Muñoz (l.c.), who also have significant expertise in *Acalypha*. The description focused primarily on vegetative characteristics, which are consistent with several annual *Acalypha* species; those that are found in the parts of northeastern Africa and southwestern Asia where Forsskål traveled are *A. brachystachya* and *A. indica*, so it makes sense that these are the species with which subsequent botanists associated it. Regarding the reproductive characters, he wrote only “*amentis axillaribus masculis, flore foemineo pedicellato, terminatis*” and, as we noted above, that the plant he saw might have lost its female bracts. Both *A. brachystachya* and *A. indica* have axillary, androgynous inflorescences (bisexual with proximal female flowers and distal male ones), and neither sheds the female bracts, which are the most reliable way to distinguish the two species. Unlike the well-spaced, subtire, conspicuous bracts of *A. indica*, those of *A. brachystachya* are tightly clustered at the base of the inflorescence, deeply lobed, and inconspicuous when young, so it is possible that Forsskål misinterpreted them as being absent. Indeed, Hornemann originally, but incorrectly, described *A. brachystachya* as lacking bracts. Why Forsskål did not see the proximal female flowers is mysterious (all the herbaceous *Acalypha* species in northeastern Africa and Yemen have androgynous inflorescences). Both *A. brachystachya* and *A. indica* also produce solitary, terminal, pedicellate female flowers (allomorphic flowers sensu Radcliffe-Smith in Kew Bull. 28: 525–529. 1973); however, the pedicels in *A. brachystachya* are 0.5–0.75 mm long, so are much less likely to have drawn Forsskål's attention than those of *A. indica*, which are 3.5–15 mm long. It is also relevant that no specimens of

A. brachystachya are known from Yemen, and recent floras exclude it from there (Wood & Haig-Thomas, Handb. Yemen Fl.: 190. 1997; Al Khulaidi, Fl. Yemen: 99–100. 2000). The only reports of *A. brachystachya* from Yemen (Schweinfurth, l.c.; Schwartz, l.c.; Govaerts & al., l.c. 2000 & <https://wmsp.science.kew.org>, accessed 18 Jan 2021) are based on the assumption that it and *A. supera* are synonyms. In contrast, *A. indica* is well-documented from Yemen.

In summary, ambiguity about the application of the name *Acalypha supera* cannot be resolved because no original material is known; we cannot support neotypification because no known species of *Acalypha* fully agrees with the protologue. Accepting *A. supera* as synonymous with *A. brachystachya* is nomenclaturally destabilizing because it replaces a long-accepted name for a weedy species found throughout sub-Saharan Africa and much of subtropical and tropical Asia, and that recently has become established in the Canary Islands (Núñez & al. in Bot. Macaronés. 28: 167. 2013), with a name that has seen only occasional use in the last 20 years. (If treated as a synonym of *A. indica*, *A. supera* has no nomenclatural impact because it lacks priority, but for reasons we cannot explain, no one has made this interpretation since the 1840s.) We therefore propose rejection of the name *Acalypha supera* under Art. 56 (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018).

Author information





GAL, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1514-1570>

VGS, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5348-0648>

Acknowledgements

We thank Barney Lipscomb, Botanical Research Institute of Texas, for bibliographic help when most libraries were closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We are grateful to John McNeill and John Wiersema for their editorial comments. Lynn Gillespie provided valuable comments on an early version of the paper. This work received support from a grant from the United States National Science Foundation (DEB-0128872) to GAL.

(2809) Proposal to conserve the name *Tetraphyllum* Griff. ex C.B. Clarke (*Gesneriaceae*) against *Tetraphyllum* Hosius & Marck (published as fossil *Magnoliophyta*)

David J. Middleton,¹  Markus Bertling,²  John McNeill³  & Michael Möller³ 

1 Singapore Botanic Gardens, National Parks Board, 1 Cluny Road, Singapore 259569

2 Geomuseum der WWU, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Corrensstr. 24, 48149 Münster, Germany

3 Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, 20A Inverleith Row, Edinburgh EH3 5LR, U.K.

Address for correspondence: David J. Middleton, David_MIDDLETON@nparks.gov.sg

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12484>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2809) *Tetraphyllum* Griff. ex C.B. Clarke in Candolle & Candolle, Monogr. Phan. 5: 136. Jul 1883 [*Gesner.*], nom. cons. prop. Typus: *T. bengalense* C.B. Clarke

(H) *Tetraphyllum* Hosius & Marck in Palaeontographica 26: 137. Apr–Mai 1880 [Foss.], nom. rej. prop. Typus: *T. dubium* Hosius & Marck