***Acacia insuavis*** Lace *Bull. Misc. Inform. Kew* 1915:401 (1915)

**Name Status:** Non-Current Name

**Name Type** Basionym Source. Pedley (2014)

**Accepted Name:** *Senegalia pennata* (Lace) Maslin, Seigler & Ebinger

**Type Citation:** “BURMA, Ani Sakan, near Maymyo, 900 m., Lace 6173.”

**Type Designation:** Lectotype (2nd step desginated by Maslin et al. 2019: 422): Myanmar, Maymyo Plateau, near Ani Sakan, alt. 3000 ft., 18 May 1913, J.H. Lace 6173 (E barcode E00318280 [digital image!]); isolectotypes: CAL n.v. -cited by Chakrabarty and Gangopadhyay (1996), E [barcode E00318279], E [barcode E00318281], K [barcode K000791207] **Source:** Maslin et al. (2019: 422); Nielsen (1980: 353); Chakrabarty and Gandopadhyay (1996: 621)

**Notes:** "In the protologue of Acacia insuavis Lace (1915) cited only a single collection, Lace 6173, but no herbarium of lodgement was indicated. Gamble (1918) mentioned that Lace specimens are at both herb. E and K; there are three specimens of Lace 6173 at E and one at K. Because there was no indication in the protologue of A. insuavis that the original description was based on a single specimen, a lectotype is needed. Nielsen (1980) cited Lace 6173 at herb. E as the holotype (but did not specify which of the three specimens this applied to), with an isotype at herb. K. Accordingly, in conformity with ICN Art.9.10 (Turland et al., 2018) and as discussed by McNeill (2014), Nielsen's holotype and isotype type citations are corrected above to lectotype and isolectotype respectively, and a second step lectotypification is undertaken here to more precisely typify this name (cf. ICN Art. 9.17). All three specimens at E are well-preserved, their label information is basically identical and none is at variance with the original description. The specimen E barcode E00318280 has been chosen as the lectotype; this sheet is stamped 'Herb. J.H. Lace. Purchased 1918'. Pedley (2014) considered the herb. K specimen of Lace 6173 as the holotype of Acacia insuavis, arguing that around the time the species was described, Lace was a frequent visitor to Kew and published in its journal. Nevertheless, this is rejected here because as stated above there is no indication that only one specimen was used to prepare the original description, and because Nielsen (1980) had already typified the name based on Lace 6173 at herb. E." (Maslin et al. 2019: 425).