

## Remarks on some of A. van de Beek's statements on *Rubus* nomenclature

in *Gorteria* 36 (4-6) and at <http://rubus-nederland.nl>

Heinrich E. Weber

19<sup>th</sup> October 2014

**Below parts of my letter to A. van de Beek** (11<sup>th</sup> Sept 2014, partially changed slightly):  
(Taxa treated in Weber-Nomenclatural-remarks-2 are omitted)

**Series Suberecti** Focke 1877. – Of course, I knew that series before I named my ser. *Nessenses*. Series *Suberecti* Focke (and the very many other “*Suberecti*” before) included always *Rubus fruticosus* L. It doesn't matter that the species of the lectotype (the panicle on the sheet) for genus *Rubus* L. is currently called *R. plicatus* Weihe & Nees because of practical nomenclatural reasons against the priority. A series (sectio or other infrageneric taxon) containing *Rubus fruticosus* L. or *R. plicatus* (the type species for genus *Rubus* L.) must be named “ser. *Rubus*”. The name “ser. *Suberecti*” was therefore according to art. 22 not validly published (see particularly art. 22.2 with Ex. 4). A not validly published name is regarded a name not published at all. Therefore I was free to establish for the first time a new series *Nessenses* based on *Rubus nessensis* ( $\equiv$  *R. suberectus*) with exclusion of the type specimen of the genus.

I put the following species into that series: *Rubus nessensis*, *R. scissus*, *R. scissoides*, *R. cubirianus*, and *R. ammobius*. They all have common features like the dark-red colour of the ripe fruits and their raspberry-like taste alongside other well known characters.

The rest is much different and belongs to series *Rubus* (in my opinion including ser. *Semisuberecti*). *Rubus plicatus* is the name for the type specimen of gen. *Rubus* L. and an infrageneric taxon containing that species is automatically to be named with the autonym *Rubus*.

**Candicantes** instead of **Discolores**. I am not sure about your statement on the “olim” at *R. candicans* Weihe. Reichenbach's short description fits *Rubus montanus* (*R. candicans* sensu Weihe), not *R. silesiacus*. But the latter name was given pro syn. so that *R. candicans* became a superfluous name. I prefer to keep the well known name *Discolores*.

**Rubus praecox** vs. **R. procerus**. – I already lectotypified the name *Rubus praecox* in *Rubi Westf.* 225 (1985) with the specimen “Bosonia, in sepibus prope Padermo, 7. 1842, Bertoloni” (BOLO). Your later typification by a different specimen is therefore invalid. The specimen I chose clearly belongs to *Rubus praecox*. I got repeatedly specimens of *Rubus praecox* gathered in the regio classica that fits very well into the large distribution area of that species (see *Atl. Fl. Eur.* 15). The name *Rubus praecox* is the correct one.

**Rubus ambigens** (Boulay) Boulay 1900. I did not see an original specimen of that species. Boulay's description (*Ass. Rub.* no. 600) doesn't sufficiently match **Rubus leucandrus** ssp. **belgicus**, even “fleurs rosées” (!) are stated. But if you together with some of your co-authors confirmed the identity, or (still better) if I could have a matching photo of the type specimen, I would accept that name.

**Rubus leucandrus** Focke 1875. – I typified that species (in *Rubi Westf.* 1985) by the specimen “Bassum [near Bremen], 24.7.1879, Focke (BREM). That specimen has nothing to do with *R. beijerinckii* (that I erroneously only 1972 partly took for *R. leucandrus* because I

found one bush of it in the area of the locus typicus). See the photo of a correct *Rubus leucandrus* specimen in Rubi Westf. p. 127. *Rubus beijerinckii* is not present in the Focke herbarium (BREM). I don't understand your later and therefore invalid typification of *Rubus leucandrus* Focke by a specimen not seen by Focke and gathered in 1883 in France. It is inadmissible to designate for the second time a type for an already typed name, unless it can be stated that the first typification was mistaken. That does not apply to this case. To my knowledge *Rubus leucandrus* s. str. doesn't occur in NL.

**Ser. Egregii** (Frid. & Gel.) Heukels 1909 = Gruppe *Egregii* Friderichsen & Gelert, Bot. Tidskr. 16: 50+76. I had always problems to place *Rubus egregius* and *R. polyanthemus* into a proper series. To have a separate ser. *Egregii* is a good solution for these two species. But what is the correct author citation? *Egregii* was called a "Gruppe" by Frid. & Gelert and validly published (art. 37.3) although acting only in cases of homonymy. Focke (1902) referred to Frid. & Gelert as the name-giving authors (so "Frid. & Gel. ex Focke"), but did *not* indicate a rank. In the index is added "(sect.)" to all infrageneric taxa. But this "sect." is not meant as the rank of a section, it merely means "infrageneric taxon". So subgen. *Chamaemorus* (Focke 1902: 441) and all other subgenera are also given in the index as "(sect.)" without intention to change their rank to a section. So Focke (1902-1903) treated all infrageneric taxa lower than subgenus without a proper rank (like Frid. & Gelert). The author citation is not clear yet, at any rate it should contain Frid. & Gelert.

***Rubus schleicheri*** Weihe. – I am not sure whether the words "interim ipse designavi" caused an invalid publication by Trattinnick 1823: 22. I translate it as "in the meantime I designated it myself" (since he could not get back the specimen Portenschlag had gathered in Switzerland). He did not say "ad interim" = temporarily, provisionally. I would be grateful if you could explain why in your opinion the publication by Trattinnick was invalid. Of course, I would be happy, if we could refer to a lectotype (instead if a neotype) at KIEL.

***Rubus bellardii*** Weihe in Bluff & Fingerhuth 1825: 688. The rejection of the name *Rubus bellardii* was also thoroughly discussed with various nomenclatural experts. Weihe gives (as later in Weihe & Ness) a clear-cut reference to "*R. glandulosus* Bellard app. fl. ped.", not *Rubus bellardii* sensu Willdenow and others. And even if so: "*Rubus bellardii* sensu Willdenow" (Enum. Pl. Horti Reg. Bot. Berol. 548. 1809) refers unambiguously to *Rubus glandulosus* Bellardi and certainly to the original specimen he got from Bellardi (still preserved in his herbarium at B, see Weber 1983). That is a member of the innumerable biotypes of *Rubus hirtus* agg. with dark glands etc. and not identical with *Rubus bellardii* sensu Weihe = ***R. pedemontanus*** Pinkwart. I would be glad if the old name *Rubus bellardii* (sensu Weihe) could be restored, but I don't see a possibility. Rather, *Rubus pedemontanus* remains the correct name.

***Rubus calvus*** H. E. Weber and ***Rubus calviformis*** H. E. Weber are synonyms. *Rubus calvus* H. E. Weber and ***R. contractipes*** H. E. Weber are different species. It is sufficient to look at the holotype (see Weber 1982: 87). I agree that the leaflets of that specimen are rather short-stalked and are thus reminiscent of *R. contractipes*. But the other features as given in the protologue are clearly different from *Rubus contractipes*, among others, the leaflets greyish-felted beneath, at least to be seen in the inflorescence from the photo. *Rubus contractipes* has (sub-)sessile lateral leaflets green beneath.

I just checked the **isotype** of ***Rubus calvus***. A photo of that sheet would not have caused any misinterpretation. Below I add a scan of the leaves of the isotype. As you see, the plant has nothing to do with *R. contractipes*. So the Dutch "*Rubus calvus*" has to be changed to *R. contractipes*. *Rubus calvus* is the name in current use for the species, rather than the simultaneously published synonym *R. calviformis*.



Leaves and stem pieces of the isotype of *Rubus calvus*. Note the leaflets greyish-felted beneath and the long-stalked lateral leaflets. *Rubus contractipes* is a very different bramble.

**Rubus horrefactus** P. J. Müller & Lef. 1859 (your lectotype at P) has a one year's priority over **R. tuberculatus** Bab. 1860 and causes a very unpleasant nomenclatural change. I didn't see original material of *R. horrefactus*, but trust your judgement. There is a group of neobotanologists in France that have held a meeting some weeks ago in the Forêt de Retz. They know *R. tuberculatus* and I am sure they will confirm your determination. (*In the meantime I saw a photo of the lectotype and the identity has been confirmed!*)

**Rubus grandiflorus** Kaltenbach 1844 (not 1845!). You found a specimen gathered and named by Kaltenbach 11 years after publication and you feel sure that this bramble belongs to the description. That might be, but there is still room for doubt. In principle, one cannot replace a name (particularly in current use) based on a holotype by a name based merely on a neotype. So **R. parahebecarpus** remains the correct name. There are some different brambles around Aachen similar to *Rubus parahebecarpus*. Foerster (1878) described several of them (besides *R. grandiflorus* his new taxa *R. immixtus* and *R. euoplus*).

**Rubus xidaeoides** Ruthe 1834. There is only a description (not a herbarium specimen) that matches most probably *R. caesius* x *idaeus*. I am sure that **Rubus xpseudoidaeus** (Weihe) Lejeune 1825 ("1824") was validly published by his reference to [the description by] Weihe [in Boennighausen 1824]. Very strange, but there are two different editions of that book. The one runs on page 102: "R. pseudo-idaeus Weihe ined. *R. breviaculeatus* N. in litt." The other

one on page 102: “*Rubus pseudo-idaeus* Weihe. *R. breviaculeatus* N. in litt.” The latter one without “ined.” was evidently a later and corrected version (once Lejeune noticed the description by Weihe in Boenninghausen 1824) and validated the nothospecies rank of that name.

But you unearthed the unknown skeleton of a *Rubus pseudo-idaeus* by a F. W. Schmidt 1791. Perhaps that name belongs also to *Rubus caesius* x *idaeus*? So the name could possibly be kept. Is it possible to send me the text of the protologue given by Schmidt 1791? (*In the meantime I saw that text in the internet. It does not match Rubus x pseudoidaeus (Weihe) Lej.*)

Your nomenclatural changes will probably cause confusion and astonishment among European batologists and at least the mistaken ones should be corrected according to the reasons pointed out above. I don't like to publish an official reply in a journal, but I am going to send my statements given above (or this entire letter) to several batologists in order to avoid unnecessary confusion.

It is a pity that you were not involved in the international discussions and decisions regarding names like *Rubus opacus*, *R. bertramii*, *R. affinis*, and *R. bellardii*. These questions have been solved, although there might still be left a space for a different interpretation. The former decisions leading to the names in current use should be kept for the sake of nomenclatural stability.