

ranging from North-East India to Australia and the South Pacific (Forman in Kew Bull. 26: 405–422. 1972, in Steenis, Fl. Males., ser. 1, 10: 172–178. 1986, in Fl. Australia 2: 365–367. 2007). While 19th and early 20th century authors accepted these two generic names as validated by Miers in the 1851 paper (e.g., Diels in Engler, Pflanz. IV. 94 (Heft 46): 48. 1910), more recent authors have been less consensual on this point. Forman (l.c. 1972: 405, l.c. 1986: 172) considered both generic names to be nomina nuda in Miers's paper of 1851. Forman accepted *Pycnarrhena* as validated by Hooker & Thomson (Fl. Ind. [2]: 206. 1855) and *Antitaxis* not until 1867 (Miers in Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 3, 20: 12. 1867), clearly then giving nomenclatural priority to *Pycnarrhena*. *Index nominum genericorum* also cited *Pycnarrhena* as validated in 1855 by Hooker & Thomson (Farr & al. in Regnum Veg. 102: 1167. 1979), but accepted *Antitaxis* as validated by Miers in 1851 (Farr & al. in Regnum

Veg. 100: 104. 1979). This view is currently shared by the major online nomenclatural references (IPNI [<https://ipni.org>], Plants of the World Online [<https://powo.science.kew.org/>], TROPICOS [<https://tropicos.org>], all accessed 28 Feb 2022).

Thus we are left with the anomaly that while *Antitaxis* has been universally cited as a synonym of *Pycnarrhena* since 1877, our main reference works give nomenclatural priority to *Antitaxis*. In order to precipitate some resolution of this problem and to maintain nomenclatural stability, I propose that *Pycnarrhena* Miers ex Hook. f. & Thomson be conserved against *Antitaxis* Miers (1851).

While Hooker and Thomson (l.c. 1855) originally mis-spelled the epithet of the one species of *Pycnarrhena* as ‘*planiflora*’, deriving this from Wallich's (Numer. List.: 4961. 1831–1832) nomen nudum “*Cocculus planiflorus*”, they later corrected this to *Pycnarrhena planiflora* (in Hooker, Fl. Brit. India 1: 106. 1872).

(2899) Proposal to conserve the name *Oxalis eckloniana* C. Presl against *O. eckloniana* F. Dietr. and *O. bifolia* (Oxalidaceae)

Kenneth C. Oberlander¹  & Ronell R. Klopper^{1,2} 

1 *H.G.W.J. Schweickerdt Herbarium, Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Pretoria, Private Bag X20, Hatfield, Pretoria 0002, South Africa*

2 *Foundational Biodiversity Sciences Division, South African National Biodiversity Institute, Private Bag X101, Pretoria, 0001 South Africa*

Address for correspondence: Kenneth Oberlander, kenneth.oberlander@up.ac.za

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12752>

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

(2899) *Oxalis eckloniana* C. Presl in Abh. Königl. Böhm. Ges. Wiss., ser. 5, 3: 459. Jul–Dec 1845 [Angiosp.: *Oxalid.*], nom. cons. prop.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): South Africa, “Arenosa prope Grünpoint” [Cape Peninsula, Green Point Commons], Jun 1827, *Ecklon 586* (S No. 14-30885 [top of sheet]; isolectotypi: HAL barcode HAL0119748, JE barcode JE00003386, M barcode M-0108533, NY barcode 00214525, PR, PRC barcode PRC 460302, W No. 0009151).

(H) *Oxalis eckloniana* F. Dietr. in Neu. Nachtr. Vollst. Lex. Gärtn. 6: 313. Jan 1837, nom. rej. prop.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): South Africa, “Brackfontein” (Clanwilliam), Jun, *Zeyher* (L barcode L 0018285; isolectotypi: HAL barcodes HAL0118868 & HAL0118872, L barcodes L 0018283 & L 0018284, M barcode M-0108529, P barcodes P00390743 & P00390744).

(=) *Oxalis bifolia* Eckl. & Zeyh. in Enum. Pl. Afric. Austral.: 92. Dec 1834–Mar 1835, nom. rej. prop.

Lectotypus (hic designatus): South Africa, “In sabulosus prope ‘Olifantsrivier’ (Clanwilliam)”, Mai, *Zeyher* (S No. 10-40978; isolectotypi: K barcode K000417340, L No. 903. 280-422 [barcode L 0018178], L No. 903.280-423 [barcode L 0018177], M barcode M-0108542, P barcode P00390360, S No. S-G-4422, W No. 0009157).

The five species currently recognised in the South African *Oxalis* L. sect. *Sagittatae* T.M. Salter (namely: *O. eckloniana* C. Presl, *O. fibrosa* F. Bolus, *O. microdonta* T.M. Salter, *O. minuta* Thunb., and *O. nidulans* Eckl. & Zeyh.) share several distinctive morphological characters: slender styles, that press outwards against the corolla tube in the lower two reproductive whorls (whether two whorls of stamens, or a whorl of stamens and whorl of styles), and sagittate anthers (Salter in J. S. African Bot. Suppl. 1. 1944). By far the most common, morphologically variable, and commercially valuable of these taxa is *O. eckloniana* C. Presl. This taxon has a tortuous nomenclatural history, which has been partly elucidated recently by Mabblerley (in J. Bot. Res. Inst. Texas 14: 250–251. 2020). At least some of the reason behind this confusion is the considerable morphological variability in this species. Another is the historical tendency to name even the most incomplete and undiagnostic specimens of *Oxalis* (“clearing up the incertae”, Salter, l.c. 1944; see Salter in J. S. African Bot. 5: 47–52. 1939 for reference to the confusion surrounding the naming of *O. pes-caprae* L. and *O. purpurea* L., two of the most widespread, well-known, and weedy South African taxa). The combination of these two phenomena has resulted in tremendous historical nomenclatural uncertainty in the genus. A very substantial effort at combatting these tendencies, at least for the South African taxa, was performed by T.M. Salter, whose monograph, “The genus *Oxalis* in South Africa: A taxonomic revision” (l.c.

1944), which is still recognised as the global authority on southern African *Oxalis*, created a mostly stable nomenclatural situation.

The type of *Oxalis eckloniana* C. Presl (*Ecklon 586*; locality “Arenosa prope Grünpoint. Juny”) was originally named *Oxalis sulphurea* Jacq. (*Oxalis*: 100, t. 63. 1794) by Ecklon & Zeyher (Enum. Pl. Afric. Austral.: 91. 1835). Presl (in Abh. Königl. Böhm. Ges. Wiss., ser. 5, 3: 459. 1845) pointed out that the specimen *Ecklon 586* and *O. sulphurea* Jacq. are not the same taxon and described *O. eckloniana* for the concept proposed by Ecklon (in Ecklon & Zeyher, l.c.). Mention by Presl (1845) of “*Oxalis sulphurea* Eckl. herb. cap. un. it. [Unio Itineraria, see Wörz in *Huntia* 13: 121–141. 2007] n. 586” has been interpreted that Ecklon (in Ecklon & Zeyher, l.c.) published the name of a new taxon, but that is not the case as Ecklon & Zeyher (l.c.) specifically referred to *O. sulphurea* Jacq. It should rather be interpreted as *O. sulphurea* sensu Eckl. & Zeyh. (1935). The name *O. eckloniana* C. Presl is here lectotypified with a specimen from the available syntypes (S No. 14-30885 [top of sheet]) that shows all the characters necessary to distinguish the species and that has been seen and confirmed by Salter.

In clearing the nomenclatural confusion surrounding *Oxalis purpurea* Sond. (in Harvey & Sonder, Fl. Cap. 1: 331. 1860, non *O. purpurea* L.), Salter (l.c. 1939) considered this taxon as conspecific with several potentially available names (*O. eckloniana* C. Presl, l.c.; *O. approximata* Sond., l.c.: 326; *O. bifolia* Eckl. & Zeyh., l.c.: 92; *O. salmonicolor* Schltr. in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 27: 156. 1899; *O. bolusii* R. Knuth in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 61(Beibl. 139): 8. 1927) and chose *O. eckloniana* C. Presl as, in his opinion, the earliest available name for this species. In the process, Salter (l.c. 1939) wrongly attributed *O. bifolia* to Sonder (l.c.: 325), and not to Ecklon & Zeyher (l.c.) to whom Sonder (l.c.: 325) specifically referred, and thus missed the fact that valid publication of the name *O. bifolia* precedes that of *O. eckloniana* C. Presl by ten years. Based on Salter (l.c. 1939), *Oxalis eckloniana* C. Presl has hitherto been maintained for the taxon represented by *Ecklon 586* by all subsequent authors working on the group (Salter, l.c. 1944; Kumwenda & al. in S. African J. Bot. 70: 259–264. 2004; Oberlander & al. in *Taxon* 53: 977–985. 2004, 60: 1667–1677. 2011) and in all recent compendia of the South African or Cape Flora (Dreyer & Makgakga in *Strelitzia* 14: 762–770. 2003; Bayer in *Strelitzia* 29: 633–640. 2012; etc.).

The diagnosis for *Oxalis bifolia* by Ecklon & Zeyher (l.c.: 92) does not mention any of the most salient diagnostic characters of the taxon based on *Ecklon 586* or its close relatives (spreading lower styles/stamens, sagittate anthers). The diagnosis is curious in that most mentioned characters are widespread in *Oxalis* (“stipitata puberula”, “foliolis obcordato-oblongis ciliatis”, “pedunculis folio longioribus”, and “corollae pallide luteae”), while the character “foliis plerumque binis” (leaves mostly two) is not distinctive of *O. eckloniana* C. Presl, nor is it common in other *Oxalis*. We agree that *O. bifolia* is conspecific with *O. eckloniana* C. Presl and the name is here lectotypified on a specimen at S (No. 10-40978) collected by Zeyher bearing a handwritten label closely matching the protologue. Most duplicates (isolectotypes) of this collection in other herbaria are labelled “*Ecklon & Zeyher 725*” and carry a label reproducing the protologue of Ecklon & Zeyher’s (l.c.) taxon number 725, which is clearly not a collection number. Collection by Zeyher alone agrees with what is reported by Ecklon (in *Flora* 16: 476–477. 1833 and in *Linnaea* 8: 390–391. 1833).

To complicate matters further, Page (Prodrum: 177. 1818) had previously proposed “*Oxalis bifolia*” in a catalogue of plants cultivated at the Southampton Botanic Gardens at the time. The section where “*O. bifolia*” is mentioned contains in tabular form a vernacular name for each taxon (two-leaved wood sorrel) and information regarding flower colour (light yellow), flowering time in cultivation (September), most suitable soil (sandy peat), the greenhouse in which it is kept (dry-stove house), and country of origin (Cape of Good Hope). Just as in *ICN* Art. 38 *Ex. 3 (Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018), the information provided for “*O. bifolia*” by Page (l.c.) (in brackets in the previous sentence) in his table was clearly not intended as a validating description or diagnosis, so Page’s (l.c.) designation is not regarded as validly published. One can only speculate that Page’s reference may have been to *O. asinina* Jacq. (l.c.: 59, t. 24), a bifoliolate Cape species to which this common name had been previously applied (see Miller & Martyn, *Gard. Dict.*, ed. 9: lxxxix. 1807; Donn, *Hort. Cantabrig.*, ed. 6: 16. 1811).

In addition, Mabberley (l.c.: 241–253) recently uncovered many validly published but previously overlooked names in Friedrich Dietrich’s *Vollständiges Lexicon der Gärtnerei und Botanik* (1802–1840), including a publication of *Oxalis eckloniana* F. Dietr. (Neu. Nachtr. Vollst. Lex. Gärt. 6: 313. 1837), which thus precedes the publication of *O. eckloniana* C. Presl by eight years. *Oxalis eckloniana* F. Dietr. was a replacement name for *O. divergens* Eckl. & Zeyh. (l.c.: 92, nom. illeg., non Benth. ex Lindl. in *Bot. Reg.* 19: t. 1630. 1833), and a lectotype has been chosen above from the syntype gathering of that replaced synonym, making both names synonyms of *O. tenella* Jacq. (l.c.: 53, t. 19). The chosen lectotype is the most complete of the available specimens and shows all distinguishing characters of the species between the two incomplete plants on the sheet. Even if the “*O. bifolia* Sond.” cited by Salter (l.c. 1939: 50) was only to Sonder’s (l.c.: 325) usage and not to that of Ecklon & Zeyher (1835), the name of Dietrich would still render *O. eckloniana* C. Presl illegitimate and the latter name is thus not available for the taxon to which it is currently applied. Given the above, Mabberley (l.c.) formally synonymized the name of *O. eckloniana* C. Presl under *O. bifolia* Eckl. & Zeyh., pending any conservation of *O. eckloniana* C. Presl or rejection of *O. eckloniana* F. Dietr. As shown above, the latter option, however, would still require the name of the taxon to be changed to *O. bifolia*, a name that has not been accepted since Sonder (l.c.).

We argue that further nomenclatural instability for this widespread, well-known, and horticulturally utilised Cape taxon is inappropriate, and therefore propose to conserve the name *Oxalis eckloniana* C. Presl against the conspecific *O. bifolia*, as well as against the earlier homonym *O. eckloniana* F. Dietr. Maintaining current use of the name *Oxalis eckloniana* C. Presl for the taxon would have the advantage of nomenclatural stability in this group with an already contorted nomenclatural history. However, without conservation, a name that has been globally recognised for over 80 years is threatened by an unfamiliar name with its own nomenclatural complications, resulting in disadvantageous nomenclatural change for both the taxonomic and horticultural communities. Furthermore, *O. eckloniana* currently comprises five varieties that will also require new combinations should the name of the species need to change, while no action would be required if the name is conserved.

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