

Author informationKCO, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6248-351X>RRK, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0948-5038>**Acknowledgements**

The authors are grateful to Prof. David Mabberley for first raising the issues surrounding the name *Oxalis eckloniana*, Dr Otakar Sida (PR) for scans of type material in PR and PRC, and to Prof. John McNeill and Dr John Wiersema for providing comments on a draft of this manuscript.

(2900) Proposal to conserve the name *Ampelopsis* (*Vitaceae*) with a conserved type

John H. Wiersema,¹  Jun Wen¹  & Gea Zijlstra² 

¹ Department of Botany, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, P.O. Box 37012, Washington, D.C. 20013-7012, U.S.A.

² Marine Palynology, Vening Meinesz Building A, Princetonlaan 8A, 3584 CB Utrecht, The Netherlands

Address for correspondence: John H. Wiersema, wiersemaj@si.edu

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12753>

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

(2900) *Ampelopsis* Michx., Fl. Bor.-Amer. 1: 159. 19 Mar 1803 [Vit.], nom. cons. prop.
Typus: *A. cordata* Michx., typ. cons. prop.

The name *Ampelopsis* Michx. (Fl. Bor.-Amer. 1: 159. 1803) is today the universally accepted name for a genus of *Vitaceae* consisting of ca. 12 species disjunctly distributed both in North America and eastern Asia (Wen & al. in Philipp. J. Sci. 142(spec. iss.): 229. 2013), and the type of the recently named tribe *Ampelopsidae* (Wen & al. in J. Syst. Evol. 56: 262–272. 2018). This application of the name has always been based on the assumption that it was typified by *A. cordata* Michx. (l.c.), one of the three original species included by Michaux (l.c.), together with *A. quinquefolia* (L.) Michx. (based on *Hedera quinquefolia* L., Sp. Pl.: 202. 1753) and *A. bipinnata* Michx., nom. illeg. The latter is an illegitimate, superfluous name for *Vitis arborea* L. (l.c.: 203), ≡ *A. arborea* (L.) Koehne, recently segregated from *Ampelopsis* as *Nekemias arborea* (L.) J. Wen & Boggan (in Phytokeys 42: 13. 2014), type of *Nekemias* Raf. (Sylva Tellur.: 87. 1838).

The generally accepted current typification on *Ampelopsis cordata* began with Rafinesque's (l.c.: 88) statement under *Ampelopsis* that "This G.[enus] must be restricted to *A. cordifolia*", reinforced by Planchon in his monograph of the family (in Candolle & Candolle, Monogr. Phan. 5: 309. 1887) with his statement that: "le prototype du genre (*Ampelopsis cordata*) et toutes les autres espèces en aient cinq" (the prototype of the genus (*Ampelopsis cordata*) and all the other species have five [petals]) and, in segregating *A. quinquefolia* to another genus, he stated (l.c.: 448): "J'adopte un nouveau nom, Parthenocissus, équivalent de Vigne vierge, parce que le nom d'*Ampelopsis* affecté spécialement à ce groupe par Torrey et Gray, est venu après celui d'*Ampelopsis* appliqué avec raison par Rafinesque aux Ampélidées du groupe des *Ampelopsis cordata* et *bipinnata*. D'ailleurs Michaux lui-même a nommé en premier lien l'*Ampelopsis cordata* comme type de son genre, et c'est par méconnaissance du vrai caractère de ce type, savoir de l'absence apparente du disque qu'il a eu le tort d'y faire entrer la Vigne vierge

ordinaire (son *Ampelopsis quinquefolia*)" (I adopt a new name, Parthenocissus, equivalent of Virginia creeper, because the name of *Ampelopsis* assigned especially to this group by Torrey and Gray, came after that of *Ampelopsis* applied with reason by Rafinesque to Ampelids of the group of *Ampelopsis cordata* and *bipinnata*. Moreover Michaux himself first named *Ampelopsis cordata* as a type of his genus, and it is through ignorance of the true character of this type, namely the apparent absence of the disc that he was wrong to include the ordinary Virginia creeper (his *Ampelopsis quinquefolia*). [It should be noted that despite Planchon's usage of the word "type" here, *Ampelopsis* Michx. (l.c.) lacked an original type.]

The following year, Asa Gray (in Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci. 23: 227. 1888) took issue with Planchon's segregation of *Ampelopsis quinquefolia* to *Parthenocissus*, stating that "*Ampelopsis quinquefolia*, Michx., remains as the proper representative of the genus, and should preserve the name. This was the course taken, in 1838, in Torrey and Gray's Flora of North America, where the genus was first rightly established [...] and this generic name has adhered to the Virginia Creeper [...] but surely *Ampelopsis*, with the Virginia Creeper as its type, must be admitted as a good genus." Indeed, Torrey & Gray (Fl. N. Amer. 1: 243–245. Oct 1838) had removed two of Michaux's three species to *Vitis*, retaining only *A. quinquefolia* in *Ampelopsis*, but this did not typify the generic name (see ICN Art. 7 Ex. 15; Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018). However, in 1861, Regel (in Mém. Acad. Imp. Sci. Saint Pétersbourg, Sér. 7, 4(4): 36. 1861) had accepted Torrey & Gray's (l.c.) taxonomy and made the statement: "Zu *Cissus* wurden demgemäss von den Arten Amerikas *V. bipinnata*, *incisa*, und *indivisa* (Torr. et Gr. I: pag. 243) zu rechnen sein. Von *Ampelopsis* wäre *A. quinquefolia* Michaux der typus [...]" (Accordingly, from the species of America *V. bipinnata*, *incisa*, and *indivisa* (Torr. et Gr. I: pag. 243) belong to *Cissus*. *A. quinquefolia* Michaux would be the type of *Ampelopsis* [...]).

Whereas Rafinesque's (l.c. Oct–Dec 1838) statement, although the earliest of these, lacked use of the term "type" (typus) or an

equivalent necessary to satisfy the provisions of Art. 7.11 for designation of *Ampelopsis cordata* as the type of *Ampelopsis*, this was not the case with Regel (l.c.), who first effectively typified the name, but on *A. quinquefolia*. This was later repeated by Pfeiffer (Nomencl. Bot. 1: 149. 1872; see ICN Art. 7 Ex. 17), both of these well before any potential typification could have been achieved by Planchon (l.c.), so there is no question that *A. quinquefolia* is the properly designated type of *Ampelopsis*.

Herein lies the problem, in that this species name, based on *Hedera quinquefolia* of Linnaeus (l.c.), is homotypic with *Parthenocissus quinquefolia* (L.) Planch. and the generic name *Parthenocissus*, originally conserved in 1912, is currently listed in Appendix III of the *Shenzhen Code* (Wiersema & al., <https://naturalhistory2.si.edu/botany/codes-proposals/>, accessed 13 Apr 2022) with *P. quinquefolia* as its conserved type. [Incidentally, we are unsure why the “typ. cons.”, first appearing in the *Edinburgh Code* (Lanjouw & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 46: 31. 1966), is necessary, as the earliest typification of this generic name appears to be by Gagnepain (in *Bull. Soc. Hist. Nat. Autun* 24: 11. 1911) on *P. quinquefolia*.] *Ampelopsis* is therefore a homotypic synonym of *Parthenocissus*. Despite its priority and not being listed as rejected in App. III (Art. 14.4), *Ampelopsis*, although still legitimate, is unavailable for use in the sense of Rafinesque (l.c.), Planchon (l.c.), and the overwhelming number of scientific articles published in the last century. In papers published since 1920, Google Scholar (accessed 13 Apr 2022) indicates 7720 that include the name “*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*” (167 in the article title) but not “*Ampelopsis*”, but only 169 that mention “*Ampelopsis quinquefolia*” (only 2 in the title) and not “*Parthenocissus*”. Those accepting *P. quinquefolia* include Tiffney & Barghoorn (in *Rev. Palaeobot. Palynol.* 22: 169–191. 1976), Soejima & Wen (in *Amer. J. Bot.* 93: 278–287. 2006), Nie & al. (in *Amer. J. Bot.* 97: 1342–1353. 2010), Chen & Manchester (in *Int. J. Pl. Sci.* 172: 1–35. 2011), Manchester & al. (in *Amer. J. Bot.* 100: 1849–1859. 2013), and Lu & al. (in *Cladistics* 34: 57–77. 2018).

If the name *Ampelopsis* cannot be used, new names will be required for the 12 species currently assigned to this genus, as well as a new generic name, as none currently exists. This will certainly create undue nomenclatural confusion and instability, which can be avoided by conservation of *Ampelopsis* Michx. with a conserved type, *A. cordata* Michx. This is the same type advocated by Rafinesque (l.c.), Planchon (l.c.), and supported by the past century of usage, and the only one of Michaux’s original species still retained in the genus.

Author Information

JHW, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9383-2807>

JW, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6353-522X>

GZ, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9894-9967>

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to John McNeill (E) for providing his analysis on the need for this proposal, and his editorial assistance in publication.

(201) Proposal to conserve the name *Larrea nitida* against *Mimosa balsamica* (*Larrea balsamica*) (*Zygophyllaceae*)

Christian A. Zanotti¹  & Daniel A. Giuliano² 

1 Instituto de Botánica Darwinion (ANCEFN-CONICET), Labardén 200, CC 22, B1642HYD, San Isidro, Buenos Aires, Argentina

2 Área de Botánica, Departamento de Ciencias Biológicas, Facultad de Ciencias Agrarias y Forestales, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Avda. 60 entre 116 y 118, 1900 La Plata, Argentina

Address for correspondence: Christian A. Zanotti, czanotti1979@gmail.com

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12757>

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

(201) *Larrea nitida* Cav. in *Anales Hist. Nat.* 2: 120, t. 18. Jun 1800 [Angiosp.: *Zygophyll.*], nom. cons. prop.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): Cult. Real Jard. Bot. Madrid, Apr 1800, *Cavanilles* [orig. coll. Née in Mendoza, Argentina] (MA barcode MA 475885, upper right-hand plant).

(=) *Mimosa balsamica* Molina, *Sag. Stor. Nat. Chili*: 165, 355. 12–31 Oct 1782 (*Larrea balsamica* (Molina) I.M. Johnst.), nom. rej. prop.

Neotypus (vide Godoy-Bürki in *Phytotaxa* 349: 134. 2018): Argentina, Chubut, Dept. Mártires, Prov. Rte. 25, between Los Altares y Las Plumas, 1 Nov 2008, *Biganzoli & Larsen* 1947 (SI barcode 092598).

Larrea nitida Cav. (in *Anales Hist. Nat.* 2: 120. 1800) is the conserved type of the conserved generic name *Larrea* Cav. This generic

name is conserved over the earlier homonym *Larrea* Ortega (Nov. Pl. Descr. Dec.: 15, t. 2. 1797) of *Fabaceae* and listed in Appendix III of the ICN. Since its publication in 1800 (over 220 years ago), the name *L. nitida* has been traditionally applied to a perennial shrub endemic to the Monte Phytogeographic Province in Argentina (Hunziker in Anton & Zuloaga, *Fl. Fanerog. Argent.* 95: 14. 2005), and in the Atacama, Coquimbo, Metropolitan, and Valparaíso Regions in Chile (Marticorena in Marticorena & Rodríguez, *Fl. Chile* 3: 122. 2011; Rodríguez & al. in *Gayana, Bot.* 75: 417. 2018). This name has been widely mentioned in numerous floristic and taxonomic treatments of the region (e.g., Descole & al. in *Lilloa* 5: 321. 1940; Lourteig in *Correa, Colecc. Ci. Inst. Nac. Tecnol. Agropecu.* 8 (Fl. Patagónica 5): 53. 1988; Hunziker, l.c.; Marticorena, l.c.; Ulloa Ulloa & al. in *Science* 358, suppl. mat.: 2497. 2017; Rodríguez & al., l.c.; Zuloaga & al. in *Darwiniana*, n.s., 7(2, Apénd. 1): 937. 2019). This species has been