***Mimosa intsia*** L. *Sp. Pl.* 1:522 (1753)

**Name Status:** Non-Current Name

**Name Type** Basionym Source. Sanjappa (1992: 40); Maslin et al. (2013: 40)

**Accepted Name:** *Senegalia intsia* (L.) Maslin, Seigler & Ebinger

**Type Citation:** No type cited but provenance given as "Habitat in India"

**Type Designation:** Lectotype (designated by Rico Arce in Turland & Jarvis 1997: 476): [icon] ‘Insja’ in Rheede, Hort. Malab. 6: t. 4 (1686)

**Notes:** Because Acacia intsia was recognized as a distinct species by Sanjappa (1992: 40), Kumar & Sane (2003: 87) and ILDIS (The International Legume Database & Information Service, Roskov et al. 2005), Maslin et al. (2013: 4) provided a combination for the species in Senegalia, despite the fact that Chakrabarty & Gangopadhyay (1996: 606) considered this name to be a nomen confusum. The identity of the basionym (Mimosa intsia) is discussed by Craib (1915) who concluded that the material upon which Plukenet's plate was based comprised two elements, a vegetative shoot of Mimosa rubricaulis (which occurs in Asia and Africa) and a detached pod of an unknown Acacia [sens. lat.] species. This plate (with no reference to Craib's interpretation) was selected by Rico Arce (in Turland & Jarvis 1997: 476) as the lectotype of M. intsia, replacing the inappropriate lectotypification of Ali (1967: 237). In view of the above it is now most considered appropriate to follow Craib and Chakrabarty & Gangopadhyay, and therefore the name Senegalia intisia is here disregarded. Jarvis (2007: 675) notes: "Ali (in Taxon 16: 237. 1967) indicated a specimen in Herb. Sloane 95: 5 (BM-SL) as the lectotype, when in fact only the corresponding illustration by Plukenet (Phytographia t. I22, f. 2. 1692), cited in the protologue, is eligible as such. In fact, this material does not support current usage, and for this reason, Rico designated a Rheede illustration as lectotype.".