***Mimosa sinuata*** Lour. *Fl. Cochinch.* 2:653 (1790)

**Name Status:** Non-Current Name

**Name Type** Heterotypic synonym Source. Nielsen (1985: 12, under Acacia concinna)

**Accepted Name:** *Senegalia rugata* (Lam.) Britton & Rose

**Type Citation:** No type cited but provenance given as "Habitat in sylvis Cochinchinae'

**Type Designation:** Type: Unknown **Source:** Nielsen (1980: 349); Maslin et al. (2019: 437)

**Notes:** Despite Mimosa sinuata being regarded here as a synonym of Senegalia rugata, the following notes by (Maslin et al. 2019: 431) are relevant: "Deciphering and interpreting past Chinese literature accounts of Acacia concinna and A. sinuata is somewhat challenging, especially because no voucher specimens were cited in most relevant works. Nevertheless, it appears most likely that elements of both Senegalia prominens and S. rugata were included in the descriptions of A. sinuata by Institute of Botany (1972), Huang (1985) and Wu (1988), and in the descriptions of A. concinna by Xing (2005), Wu (2008) and Wu and Nielsen (2010). However, the illustrations in Huang (1985),Wu (1988) and Wu (2008) are clearly of S. prominens, while the photo in Xing (2005) is most likely of S. rugata. Although the description of A. concinna by Wu and Nielsen (2010) applies to S. rugata, most Chinese provincial occurrences they cited for that species probably refer to S. prominens.". Maslin et al. (2019: 441) provide the following regarding Mimosa (Acacia) sinuata: "Like Nielsen (1980) we have been unable to locate a type for Mimosa sinuata. This is not surprising because, as noted by Merrill (1935), very few Loureiro types are extant. Although no type specimen was cited in the protologue, Loureiro (1790) did say that the species occurred in “Cochinchinae”. This geographic name is not in current use, but in the past it most often referred to the southern one third of present-day Vietnam (although originally it referred to the southern half of Vietnam, extending southwards from just north of Hue). Loureiro's chief place of residence during the 36 years that he lived in Cochinchina was Hue (Merrill, 1935) so it is possible that the entity he described as M. sinuata was based on material collected from that general vicinity. We agree with the interpretation by Merrill (1935) that Loureiro's description of Mimosa sinuata probably refers to the entity hitherto called Acacia concinna (Senegalia rugata), especially as the inflorescences were described as axillary and solitary and the pods as sinuous (presumably a reference to the pod margins that are normally constricted between the seeds). These two characters are otherwise uncommon in Asian Senegalia. However, the description of the flowers as 4-merous and the corolla as absent by Loureiro (1790) are curious; these may be errors or perhaps there was some species additional to S. rugata that was included in Loureiro's concept of M. sinuata. Notwithstanding the above, Acacia sinuata has been variously treated by authors in the past, and there has been much confusion concerning this name in Chinese literature. Nielsen (1980) regarded it as a dubious name, but later treated it as a provisional synonym of A. concinna Nielsen (1981, 1985b), as did Sun and Chen (1990). Nielsen (1992), Sun (2006) and Wu and Nielsen (2010) treated A. sinuata as conspecific with A. concinna, without qualification. The name Acacia sinuata appears to have been first introduced into Chinese taxonomic literature by Institute of Botany (1972) followed by Huang (1985) and Wu (1988). These three publications all treated A. sinuata as a distinct species with the last two giving A. concinna as a synonym. The three descriptions are very similar to one another, and each is accompanied by an illustration, but no voucher specimens were cited. It appears most likely that all three descriptions contain elements that apply to Senegalia prominens (e.g. leaflets hairy and inflorescences paniculately arranged) while the first two describe pods that are clearly those of S. rugata (i.e. slightly succulent, wrinkled when dry: these attributes were not mentioned by Wu (1988); the illustrations in all three works appear to be of S. prominens only. This confusion concerning the definition of A. sinuata in China is also seen on herbarium specimens. During the course of this study we located many specimens of S. prominens at herb. IBK and IBSC that were determined as either A. concinna or A. sinuata.".