

## Atlas Florae Europaeae notes. 16. New names in *Rubus* (Rosaceae)

Alexander N. Sennikov<sup>1,\*</sup> & Heinrich E. Weber<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> Botanical Museum, Finnish Museum of Natural History, P.O. Box 7, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland; Herbarium, Komarov Botanical Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences, Prof. Popov str. 2, RU-197376 St. Petersburg, Russia (\*corresponding author's e-mail: alexander.sennikov@helsinki.fi)

<sup>2)</sup> Department of Biology, University of Vechta, Driverstrasse 22, D-49377 Vechta, Germany

Received 14 Dec. 2009, revised version received 21 Jan. 2010, accepted 22 Jan. 2010

Sennikov, A. N. & Weber, H. E. 2010: Atlas Florae Europaeae notes. 16. New names in *Rubus* (Rosaceae). — Ann. Bot. Fennici 47: 67–70.

The typification of *Rubus scissus* W.C.R. Watson is corrected. This name is to be applied to *R. nessensis* Hall subsp. *scissoides* H.E. Weber *nom. inval.*, and *R. scissus auct.* is redescribed here as a new species *R. ochracanthus* H.E. Weber & Sennikov. Three species names earlier published with two types (*R. christianseniorum* H.E. Weber, *R. insulariopsis* H.E. Weber, *R. stormanicus* H.E. Weber) are validated here by type designation.

Key words: European flora, new names, new species, nomenclature, Rosaceae, *Rubus*, typification.

### Introduction

The name *Rubus fissus* Lindl. (Lindley 1835), one of the oldest in *Rubus* subsect. *Rubus* (Rosaceae), had been considered “universally” misapplied “ever since” its original publication (Watson 1937). Watson (1937) has proven that the original specimen of *R. fissus* kept in CGE belongs to the species later called *R. rogersii* E.F. Linton. This specimen from a plant of Scottish origin (Ayrshire county), “sent to” the garden of the Royal Horticultural Society, is directly referred to in the protologue, being therefore the holotype (Edees & Newton 1988).

The taxon, to which the name *R. fissus* was subsequently misapplied (also by Lindley himself, as evident from his identifications), was named by Watson (1937). Watson believed he

was making a new name (*nomen novum*). Since he was actually dealing with publication of a name for a taxon previously known under a misapplied name, in accord with Art. 33, Note 2 of the Code (McNeill *et al.* 2006), Watson's action is technically considered as publication of a name of a new taxon, with the relevant provisions to apply.

Weber (1985) pointed out that the description provided by Watson (1937) is written in English, and Watson's only reference to a Latin description needed after 1935 (Art. 36.1) was that to *R. fissus* in Focke (1877). Weber accepted the description of *R. fissus* in Focke (1877) as the validating one for *R. scissus*, and designated the lectotype of the latter name from the context of that description under Art. 32.2 of the Sydney Code (Voss 1983). Weber's type was collected

in Germany. The same gathering (but with the lectotype in K) was subsequently designated by Eedes and Newton (1988).

By that typification, the name *R. scissus* was transferred from the taxon implied by Watson (1937) as having the prickles situated all round the glabrous stems, slender and purple, and being considered part of the polymorphic *R. nessensis* Hall by Weber (1973, 1985), to the similar species with yellowish prickles confined to the angles of unevenly hairy stems, which Weber (1973) circumscribed anew and separated from the similar taxa. The circumscription of this taxon in Focke (1877) included both species as evident from the pubescence of stems described as variable, but the colour of prickles was omitted in his descriptions.

However, with subsequent changes introduced into the Code, Weber's typification is not valid any more. Watson (1937) explicitly designated another type already in the protologue of his *R. scissus*, citing as "lectotype" specimen no. 29 in Herbarium Borrer (K). This designation is correctable to holotype under Art. 9.8 (see also Art. 37.3, Ex. 3) and is acceptable under Art. 7.7, second part of the first clause, as already done by Van de Beek (1974). No other type designations are permitted.

The original Watson type belongs to the taxon described by Weber (1973) as *R. nessensis* subsp. *scissoides* H.E. Weber. This designation, as well as the other combination *R. scissoides* "(H.E. Weber) G.H. Loos" based thereon (Loos 2007), was invalidly published because two gatherings collected at different times from the same plant were simultaneously designated as types (Art. 37.2, Ex. 1). Currently, the only legitimate species name for this taxon is *R. scissus*.

Weber (1973, 1985) treated this taxon as a subspecies of *R. nessensis*, whereas *R. "scissus"* (*R. ochracanthus*) was given the species rank in these works. Zieliński (2004) and Henker and Kiesewetter (2009) considered *R. "scissoides"* as a possible hybrid between *R. nessensis* and *R. "scissus"*. The latter authors emphasised that it should be treated as a species of its own (as we do here) with regard to its characters and independent distribution area. Loos (2007) was first who formally accepted *R. "scissoides"* at the species level, stating that even though some

herbarium samples may be difficult to identify, it is well distinguishable in nature. The species with yellowish prickles is currently nameless and should receive a new name provided here.

Three other species names *R. christianseniorum*, *R. insulariopsis* and *R. stormanicus* were not validly published by Weber (1973) in Art. 37.2, being validated here. Earlier it was a common practice to make a compound gathering for a proper *Rubus* specimen, when an inflorescence taken from two years old stems, and subsequently a sample from annual stems (primocane) with well-developed leaves, were collected from the same plant. This tradition was considered reasonable because the taxonomically important leaves are often not fully developed at the flowering time, and such a type was therefore deemed to be more comprehensive. Unfortunately, this practice was precluded by definition of the holotype and its duplicates (constituting a gathering collected at the same time) already in Art. 7 of the Seattle Code (Staffeu 1972).

## Nomenclatural treatment

### *Rubus scissus* W.C.R. Watson

J. Bot. 75: 162. 1937. — TYPE: Great Britain. Shrewsbury: Almond Park, 1836 W.A. *Leighton* in Herb. Borrer 29 (K, holotype).

*Rubus nessensis* Hall subsp. *scissoides* H.E. Weber, Phanerog. Monogr. 7: 108. 1973, *nom. inval.* (Art. 37.2). — *Rubus scissoides* H.E. Weber ex G.H. Loos, Florist. Rundbr. 40(1): 141. 2007, *nom. inval.* (Art. 37.2). — ORIGINAL MATERIAL: Germany. Linnerbruch bei Wittlage, 27.VI.1971 [flowers] & 11.VIII.1971 [leaves] *H. Weber 71627.1* (KIEL, HBG, Herb. Weber).

ILLUSTRATIONS: Henker & Kiesewetter 2009: 143, *sub nom. R. scissoides*.

### *Rubus ochracanthus* H.E. Weber & Sennikov, *sp. nova*

*A Rubo scisso aculeis chloroticis (non intense violaceis) et turionibus angulatis partim pubescentibus (non glabris) differt. Hoc modo etiam a R. nessensi distinguitur.*

TYPE: Germany. Magdeburg, an sumpfigen Waldstellen bei Altenhausen, 1870 *G. Maass* [W.O. Focke, Rubi Selecti

no. 33, *sub nom. Rubus fissus*] (LE, holotype; ER, K, W, Z, isotypes).

*Rubus scissus auct. non* W.C.R. Watson: Weber 1973: 111–113, 1985: 78–81, 1995: 348–349; Edees & Newton 1988: 33; Zieliński 2004: 28–32; Henker & Kiese-wetter 2009: 144–145, *sub nom. R. scissus*.

ETYMOLOGY: The species epithet means “pale yellow” in Greek and refers to the yellowish colour of its prickles in contrast to the violet prickles of its relatives *R. scissus* and *R. nessensis*.

Stems suberect, 0.5–1.2 m tall, angled with flat sides, dull green, unevenly hairy or partly subglabrous, with abundant sessile and subsessile glands. Prickles greenish-yellow, 3–4(5) mm long, up to 18–30 per 5 cm, needle-like, straight, situated on the angles of the stem. Leaves mostly with 6–7 leaflets, dull (yellowish) green above, with 50 to over 100 hairs per cm<sup>2</sup>, green beneath, softly hairy; terminal leaflet ovate to elliptic, shortly acuminate, with cordate base, on 5-foliolate leaves mostly 2–3-incised, evenly or unevenly densely serrate, with acute teeth 2–4 mm long; basal leaflets with petiolules 0–2 mm long; petiole hairy, with sessile glands and (15–)30 slightly curved prickles. Flowering branches with simple and 3-foliolate leaves. Inflorescence usually with 5–10 flowers; rachis loosely hairy, with 3–9 thin, rather curved prickles 2(3) mm long per 5 cm. Peduncles loosely hairy, with sessile to subsessile glands and (2)3–9 rather curved prickles (0.5)1–2 mm long. Flowers 2–2.5 cm in diameter; sepals bright green with a narrow white border, usually with a few prickles, apiculate; petals 7–8 mm long, white, narrowly obovate to subelliptic; stamens with white filaments, not exceeding the green styles; anthers glabrous; carpels hairy. Fruit small, dark red when ripe, often partly abortive.

ILLUSTRATIONS: Weber 1973: 113, 402; Weber 1995: fig. 298; Henker & Kiese-wetter 2009: 145; Zieliński 2004: fig. 16–17, all *sub nom. R. scissus*.

DISTRIBUTION: Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Russia (Kaliningrad Region, old records only), Sweden (Edees & Newton 1988, Weber 1985, 1995). Distribution area subatlantic.

HABITAT ECOLOGY: Among bushes, in sparse forests and peatlands. Acidophyte, calcifugous. Prefers moderately to exceedingly moist soils,

paludified sand substrates and peat. In Germany it occurs in shrubs of the *Rubetalia plicati* on acid sand, drained highmoor bogs and in clearings of paludified forests.

### ***Rubus christianseniorum* H.E. Weber, *sp. nova***

Validating description: under *R. christianseniorum* H.E. Weber (Weber 1973: 322–323). — TYPE: Germany. Holstein, Straße zw. Heinkenborstel und Hohenwestedt beim Stein 6.9 km, 20.IX.1966 *H.E. Weber 66.920.2, tantum folia* (KIEL, holotype; HBG, Herb. Weber, isotypes).

ILLUSTRATIONS: Weber 1973: 325, 469.

### ***Rubus insulariopsis* H.E. Weber, *sp. nova***

Validating description: under *R. insulariopsis* H.E. Weber (Weber 1973: 214). — TYPE: Germany. Holstein, Linau bei Trittau, 4.IX.1967 *H.E. Weber 67.712.2, tantum folia* (KIEL, holotype; HBG, Herb. Weber, isotypes).

ILLUSTRATIONS: Weber 1973: 213, 437; Henker & Kiese-wetter 2009: 75.

### ***Rubus stormanicus* H.E. Weber, *sp. nova***

Validating description: under *R. stormanicus* H.E. Weber (Weber 1973: 311). — TYPE: Germany. Holstein, Wegrund zw. Hoisdorf und Gölm, 2.IX.1970 *H.E. Weber 70.716.2, tantum folia* (KIEL, holotype).

ILLUSTRATIONS: Weber 1973: 313, 466; Henker & Kiese-wetter 2009: 167.

## References

- Edees, E. S. & Newton, A. 1988: *Brambles of the British Isles*. — The Ray Society, London.
- Focke, W. O. 1877: *Synopsis Ruborum Germaniae. Die deutschen Brombeerarten ausführlich beschrieben und erläutert*. — C. Ed. Müller's Verlagsbuchhandlung, Bremen.
- Henker, H. & Kiese-wetter, H. 2009: *Rubus-Flora von Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (Brombeeren, Kratzbeere, Himbeeren, Steinbeere)*. — *Bot. Rundbr. Meckl.-Vorpomm.* 44: 1–273.
- Lindley, J. 1835: *A synopsis of the British flora, arranged according to the natural orders, containing vasculares, or flowering plants*, 2nd ed. — Longman, London.
- Loos, G. H. 2007: Taxonomische Revision einiger einander nahestehender Brombeersippen (*Rubus* L. subgen. *Rubus*, Rosaceae). — *Florist. Rundbr.* 40: 131–143.
- McNeill, J., Barrie, F. R., Burdet, H. M., Demoulin, V.,

- Hawksworth, D. L., Marhold, K., Nicolson, D. H., Prado, J., Silva, P. C., Skog, J. E., Wiersema, J. H. & Turland, N. J. (eds.) 2006: International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (Vienna Code) adopted by the Seventeenth International Botanical Congress Vienna, Austria, July 2005. — *Regnum Veg.* 146: I–XVIII + 1–568.
- Staffeu, F. A., Bonner, C. E. B., McVaugh, R., Meikle, R. D., Rollins, R. C., Ross, R., Schopf, J. M., Schulze, G. M., de Vilmorin, R. & Voss, E. G. 1972: International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Eleventh International Botanical Congress, Seattle, August 1969. — *Regnum Veg.* 82: 1–426.
- Van de Beek, A. 1974: *Die Brombeeren des Geldrischen Distriktes innerhalb der Flora der Niederlande*. — Ph.D. thesis, Tiiburg.
- Voss, E. G., Chaloner, W. G., Demoulin, V., Hiepko, P., McNeill, J., Meikle, R. D., Nicolson, D. H., Rollins, R. C., Silva, P. C. & Greuter, W. 1983: International Code of Botanical Nomenclature adopted by the Thirteenth International Botanical Congress, Sydney, August 1981. — *Regnum Veg.* 111: I–XV + 1–472.
- Watson, W. 1937: Notes on *Rubi* (continued). — *J. Bot.* 75: 156–163.
- Weber, H. E. 1973 (“1972”): Die Gattung *Rubus* L. (Rosaceae) im nordwestlichen Europa vom Nordwestdeutschen Tiefland bis Skandinavien mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Schleswig-Holsteins. — *Phanerog. Monogr.* 7: I–VII + 1–504.
- Weber, H. E. 1985: *Rubi westfalici*. Die Brombeeren Westfalens und des Raumes Osnabrück (*Rubus* L., subgenus *Rubus*): Bestimmung, Taxonomie, Nomenklatur, Ökologie, Verbreitung. — *Abh. Westf. Mus. Naturk.* 47(3): 1–452.
- Weber, H. E. 1995: *Rubus* L. — In: Hegi, G. [Weber, H. E. (ed.)], *Illustrierte Flora von Mitteleuropa* 4(2a), Ed. 3: 284–595. Blackwell Wissenschafts-Verlag, Berlin etc.
- Zieliński, J. 2004: The genus *Rubus* (Rosaceae) in Poland. — *Polish Bot. Stud.* 16: 1–300.