

Ateneo de Manila University

Archium Ateneo

Biology Faculty Publications

Biology Department

4-17-2021

(2807) Proposal to Conserve the Name *Acalypha wilkesiana* against *A. tricolor* (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](#)

can be identified as belonging to *H. syriacum* (Jacq.) Dum. Cours. [sub *H. lavandulaefolium*].

There is a relevant specimen at LINN, Herb. Linnaeus No. 689.56 (LINN), that bears a plant with leaves, flowers, and fruits and is annotated as “*racemosus*” by Linnaeus at the base of the specimen. The sheet contains a label annotated as “46. *Cistus* / *varietas pilosi?*” (image available at <http://linnean-online.org/6476/>). According to the metadata associated with this sheet at the website of The Linnean Collections, the specimen was collected by Louis-Guillaume Le Monnier. Le Monnier, sometimes written as Lemonnier (1717–1799), was a French natural scientist and contributor to the *Encyclopédie*.

I have been unable to locate any further original material in any Linnaean or Linnaean-linked herbaria. Among the located original elements, I selected the specimen No. 689.56 (LINN) as the lectotype of *Cistus racemosus*. This specimen matches the traditional concept of *C. violaceus* and the current use of *Helianthemum violaceum* (see, e.g., Cavanilles, l.c.; Willkomm, l.c. 1880; Bolòs & Vigo, l.c.; López González, l.c. 1993; Mateo & al., l.c.; Mateo & Crespo, Claves Ilustr. Fl. Valenciana: 130. 2014).

In summary, for the purpose of nomenclatural stability, I propose conservation of *Cistus violaceus* Cav. against *C. racemosus* L. under Art. 14.1 of the *ICN*. Rejection of this proposal would have an undesirable consequence because the name *C. violaceus* would be included as a heterotypic synonym of the unknown and ignored Linnaean name *C. racemosus*, and, therefore, the well-known name *Helianthemum violaceus*, used in a large number of works, would need to be replaced by *Helianthemum racemosum* (L.) Desf. (Tabl. École Bot.: 153. 1804), a name little known and used.

Author information

PPFG, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7595-9302>

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Mats Hjertson (UPS, Museum of Evolution, Botany Section, Uppsala University, Sweden) for the images of the herbarium sheets. Thanks to Ricardo Garilleti (Valencian University, Spain) for his help in the study of the Cavanilles Herbarium. Thanks also to Dr. John Wiersema and Dr. John McNeill for their advice, assistance, and valuable comments that improved this proposal.

(2807) Proposal to conserve the name *Acalypha wilkesiana* against *A. tricolor* (*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.12482>

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

(2807) *Acalypha wilkesiana* Müll. Arg. in Candolle, Prodr. 15(2): 817. Aug (sero) 1866 [Angiosp.: *Euphorb.*], nom. cons. prop. Typus: Fiji, [Viti Levu], Rewa, “*Unit. Stat. explor. exped. under Capt. Wilkes*” (G-DC barcodes G00324021 & G00324022; isotypi: GH barcode GH00045512, K barcode K000959008, US Nos. 1944717 & 1944718 [barcodes 00096423 & 00096424]).

(=) *Acalypha tricolor* Veitch ex Mast. in Gard. Chron. 1866: 483. 26 Mai 1866, nom rej. prop.

Neotypus (hic designatus): “Hort. Veitch, New Hebrides [Vanuatu]”, Jul 1844 (K barcode K001235482).

In late August 1866, Johannes [Jean] Müller [“Argoviensis”] described *Acalypha wilkesiana* Müll. Arg. (in Candolle, Prodr. 15(2): 817. 1866) from material collected in Fiji during the United States Exploring Expedition commanded by Captain Charles Wilkes, 1838–1842. This species is not known from the wild, but has long been cultivated as an ornamental in Melanesia (Pax & Hoffmann in Engler, Pflanzenr. IV. 147 XVI (Heft 65): 153. 1924; Fosberg & Sachet in Smithsonian Contr. Bot. 45: 10. 1980); by 1866 it was being grown

in Europe (Nicholson, Ill. Dict. Gard. 1: 7. 1885). It is now popular throughout the world, being grown for its showy, usually multicolored leaves that sometimes have unusual shapes. It has escaped from cultivation and become naturalized in tropical and subtropical parts of Africa, the Americas, and Asia (Govaerts & al., World Checkl. Euphorb., <https://wesp.science.kew.org>, accessed 20 Jan 2021; Levin in FNA Ed. Comm., Fl. N. Amer. N. Mexico 12: 165. 2016).

Among the synonyms of *Acalypha wilkesiana* listed by Seemann (Fl. Vit.: 225. 1867) and some later authors (e.g., Pax & Hoffmann, l.c.) is *A. tricolor* Hort., with no reference to a place of publication. However, as shown by Mabblerley (in Feddes Reper. 101: 275. 1990), this name was published in *The Gardeners’ Chronicle* (Gard. Chron. 1866: 483. 1866) in reference to a plant given that name by the nurseryman and plant collector John Gould Veitch. The article was not signed, but appears to have been written by the newspaper’s editor, Maxwell Tylden Masters, to which the International Plant Names Index (<https://www.ipni.org/n/337889-1>, accessed 19 Jan 2021) attributes the name. Although the description is brief (an *Acalypha* “with ovate acuminate leaves of a brownish-green cast, and some of the portions as if they had been stained with red lead”),

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