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

Alexander N. Sennikov1,* & Heinrich E. Weber2

1) 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)

2) 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


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.
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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 Edees 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 (Stafleu 1972).

**Nomenclatural treatment**

*Rubus scissus* W.C.R. Watson


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

A Rubo scisso aculeis chloroticis (non intense violaceis) et turionibus angulatis partim pube-scentibus (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).

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 cm², 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 petiololes 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 sub sessile 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.


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


Rubus insulariopsis H.E. Weber, sp. nova


Rubus stormanicus H.E. Weber, sp. nova
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