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phyletic, but the three others were not. Testolin and Ferguson (1997) used isozyme variation to evaluate Liang’s system (Liang 1984), and their results were not well in line with the four-section scheme of Li (1952). RAPD and AFLP analyses revealed only A. sect. Leiocarpae as monophyletic (Huang et al. 2002, Li et al. 2005). However, Li et al. (2002) and Chat et al. (2004) showed A. sect. Leiocarpae to be paraphyletic, and the three other sections to be polyphyletic. Surprisingly all four sections were not monophyletic but polyphyletic in the analysis of PCR-RFLPs of mtDNA (Li et al. 2002, 2003). The three other sections to be polyphyletic. At the present time, we still accept the scheme of Li (1952), because it reflects the morphological differentiation among Actinidia species. However, the name A. sect. Maculatae was not published validly, and the names A. sect. Leiocarpae and A. sect. Stellatae lack types. To enable formal use of the names (Li 1952), the sectional nomenclature is reviewed here with adherence to the rules of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (McNeill et al. 2006).

Actinidia sect. Strigosae H.L. Li


Under Art. 22.6 (McNeill et al. 2006), the type of the name A. sect. Strigosae is the same as that of A. strigosa Hook. f. & Thomson, because Li (1952) did not designate another type.

Actinidia sect. Leiocarpae Dunn


Actinidia sect. Ampulliferae and A. sect. Leiocarpae were established by Dunn (1911). Subsequently Li (1952) treated the former as a taxonomic synonym of the latter. We accept Li’s treatment. Following Art. 11.5 (McNeill et al. 2006), A. sect. Leiocarpae has priority over A. sect. Ampulliferae.

Under Art. 10.5 (McNeill et al. 2006), we lectotypify A. sect. Leiocarpae with A. kolomikta and A. sect. Ampulliferae with A. melanandra Franch. We thus agree with Li (1952) that A. kolomikta and A. melanandra belong to the same section. Dunn (1911) included only one species, A. kolomikta, in A. sect. Leiocarpae, but he cited several other names of species in synonymy, including A. platyphylla A. Gray ex Miq., with a different type than A. kolomikta. Actinidia melanandra was put in A. sect. Ampulliferae by Dunn (1911). It has glabrous leaves and a bottle-shaped ovary, fitting better the protologue of A. sect. Ampulliferae, and a relatively wide geographic distribution.

Actinidia sect. Vestitae Dunn


Li (1952) split A. sect. Vestitae into two
sections, placing all eligible elements as the lectotype of A. sect. Vestitae into either A. sect. Stellatae or A. sect. Strigosae. According to Art. 11.4 (McNeill et al. 2006), even when A. sect. Vestitae was split, this name should have been retained by Li (1952) for one of his sections. In the present paper, under Art. 10.5 (McNeill et al. 2006), we lectotypify both A. sect. Vestitae and A. sect. Stellatae with A. chinensis. So we accordingly treat A. sect. Stellatae as a junior taxonomic synonym of A. sect. Vestitae. Actinidia chinensis, which was placed in A. sect. Vestitae by Dunn (1911) and in A. sect. Stellatae by Li (1952), is widely distributed in China and is also widely cultivated in the world (Li 1952, Li et al. 2007).

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by grants from the Chinese Academy of Sciences (KSCX2-YW-Z-049) and from Wuhan Botanical Garden, the Chinese Academy of Sciences (O754521G04).

References


