

THE NOMENCLATURE OF *SALVIA ACETABULOSA*

I. C. HEDGE

During the course of work on the *Salvias* of the eastern Mediterranean, the authority for the widespread species known as *Salvia acetabulosa* has come under review. Although it is most frequently attributed to Vahl (Enumeratio, i, 227: 1805), this is not the first description of the species and, in fact, the original Linnaean reference is cited in the synonymy. There is, therefore, no question of there being an independent *S. acetabulosa* Vahl. Furthermore, *S. acetabulosa* of Linnaeus was erroneously described as being an Orient plant whereas, actually, its distribution is South African.

Two problems, therefore, arise: the identity of *S. acetabulosa* Linn.; and the correct designation for the East Mediterranean species.

In his Mantissa (i, 25: 1767), Linnaeus described *S. acetabulosa* as a new species with "Habitat in Oriente". The previous references that are given are to Gronovius (Fl. Orient. 4, no. 10: 1755) and Morison (Hist. iii, 399: 1699). Neither of these references is applicable to the plant that Linnaeus was describing. The specimen in the Linnaean herbarium agrees in all respects with the original diagnosis and description: it is, therefore, the type of *S. acetabulosa* Linn. Linnaeus received the specimen from one of the Burmanns at Amsterdam, who, in turn, had probably received it from some unknown source in South Africa. Written on the attached label in (according to Savage) the elder Burmann's hand is "*Salvia orientalis frutescens serratis foliis calice hirsuto flore violaceo stamine longissimo.*" Presumably because of this label, Linnaeus was misled as to the provenance of the specimen and consequently associated it with the descriptions of the Orient species given by Gronovius and Morison. This would have been quite an easy mistake at that time since the two species in question, Orient and South African, do have certain features in common, both being members of Section *Hymenosphace* Benth. In addition to Johannes Burmann's label, his son Nikolaus had written on the sheet "*S. Chamelaegna*," which certainly refers to a South African plant.* Burmann must, therefore, have been aware of its origin even though his identification was incorrect. The true identity of *S. acetabulosa* Linn. is, in fact, with *S. africana*—also a Linnaean species! The type specimen of *S. africana* in the Clifford herbarium, the specimen in the Linnaean herbarium and the type of *S. acetabulosa* Linn. agree perfectly with each other. Because *S. africana* was first described in the Species Plantarum (ed. 2, 38: 1762) and *S. acetabulosa* in the Mantissa (1767), *S. acetabulosa* must be reduced to a synonym of *S. africana*.

The occurrence of the name *S. acetabulosa* with a Plukenet synonym in N. L. Burmann's Prodrumus Florae Capensis can be disregarded as it appeared in the year following the publication of the Mantissa (i.e. in 1768). It rather suggests, however, that Burmann and Linnaeus had

* The name was most probably taken from a *Salvia* description by Breyn (Cent. t. 85:1678). *S. chamelaegna* (syn. *S. paniculata* Linn.) was first described by Bergius (Descr. Pl. Cap. Bon. Spei, 3: 1767). It is spelt as *S. Chamelaegnus* by N. L. Burmann (Prod. Fl. Cap.:1768).

previously agreed on the name '*acetabulosa*' for what they believed was a new species and, for the reason suggested above, Linnaeus assigned it to the wrong country.

With regard to the name of the East Mediterranean plant, Bentham (Labiatae, 214: 1833) continued to call it *S. acetabulosa* but, possibly aware of the taxonomic tangle, attributed the authorship to Vahl. Most subsequent authors, Boissier included, continued to use this invalid citation. Pobedimova, in the Flora U.R.S.S., resuscitating the genus *Schraderia* Medik., calls the plant *Schraderia acetabulosa* (Vahl) Pobed.

Examination of the species synonymy, and the specimens involved, revealed that it is another Vahl name, *S. multicaulis*, which is the earliest post-Linnaean synonym and must, consequently, be adopted as the valid specific epithet for the Orient species. *S. multicaulis* was originally described in Vahl's Enumeratio (i, 225: 1805) from a specimen in Desfontaine's herbarium. The only difference between it and *S. acetabulosa* sec. Vahl non Linn., and which must have been Vahl's reason for specific separation in the Enumeratio, is the ternate leaf in *S. acetabulosa* and the simple leaf in *S. multicaulis*. As, however, all transitional leaf forms are to be found, even on the same plant, there is no reason to question their being conspecific.

***Salvia multicaulis* Vahl, Enumeratio, i, 225 (1805).**

Syn.: *Salvia syriaca cisti feminae foliis acetabulis moluccae*. Morison, Hist. iii, 399 (1699).

Salvia foliis ovatis calyce turbinato limbo amplissimo. Gronovius, Fl. Or. 4 (1755).

"*S. acetabulosa*" sec. Vahl, Enum. i, 227 (1805) non Linn. (exclud. syn.); Benth., Labiatae, 214 (1833) et apud DC., Prodr. xii, 271 (1848); Boiss., Fl. Or. iv, 608 (1879).

S. acetabulosa Vahl [sic] var. *simplicifolia* Boiss. l.c.

S. Molucellae Benth., Labiatae (1833) et apud DC. Prodr. xii, 273 (1848).

S. Szovitziana Bge. Lab. Pers. 43 (1873).

S. acetabulosa Vahl [sic] var. *Szovitziana* (Bge.) Bornm. in Beih. bot. Zbl. xxii, 2 Abt. 121 (1907).

Schraderia acetabulosa (Vahl) Pobed. [sic] in Komarov, Fl. U.R.S.S., xxi, 369 (1954).