

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

at <http://rubus-nederland.nl>

Heinrich E. Weber

18th October 2014

Rubus affinis Weihe & Nees. – That name is a nomen superfluum for *Rubus fruticosus* L. since Weihe & Nees (1822: 22, Latin version) did as a synonym not only cite *Rubus fruticosus* Linnaeus, Fl. Suec. Ed. 1: 409 (1745) but also *Rubus fruticosus* L. Fl. Suec. Ed. 2: 172, 144 (1755). That illegitimacy was in the 1980s widely discussed and decided by British, Swedish and German experts in nomenclature and accepted as well by Edees & Newton for their monograph on British brambles (1988) as by myself.

The lectotype of *Rubus fruticosus* L. at LINN as chosen by A. Beek (1974) contained two different species: An inflorescence of *Rubus plicatus* Weihe & Nees and the upper part of a primocane of a bramble sect. *Corylifolii* with leaves somewhat greyish beneath and with a serration different from *Rubus plicatus* (see <http://linnean-online.org/6358/>). Weber (1986) limited therefore the lectotype to the inflorescence. *Rubus fruticosus* L. is an older name for *Rubus plicatus*. But for reasons of nomenclatural stability the name *Rubus fruticosus* – which has been for a long time constantly regarded a nomen ambiguum (see Weber 1986) and is till now only used in a broad aggregate sense – has not been accepted as the correct name for *Rubus plicatus*.

A. van de Beek (2014a) has shown that ***Rubus bergeri*** Cham. & Schltdl. ex Eckl. & Zeyh. 1835 is an older synonym of *Rubus vigorosus* P. J. Müll. & Wirtgen 1862. As in case of other changes (see below) one must follow the Code and replace *Rubus vigorosus* by *R. bergeri*.

Unfortunately, the Botanical Code still supports the unearthing of unknown old names in order to replace well known names in current use. Hopefully, it will follow one day the principle in the current Zoological Code (highlighting in the text by me). In the previous version a zoologist had to ask a commission before replacing a name in current use. Now those changes are automatically refused:

*“Perhaps the most significant operational change which the Commission has approved, is to introduce a number of automatic courses of action in cases which previously called for intervention by the Commission. These include **requiring automatic departure from the Principle of Priority** in certain cases in which the existing usage of names or spellings is threatened by the threatened revival of unused names proposed before 1900.”*

Rubus hirtus Waldstein & Kitaibel 1804. – Since the 1970s I have known the specimen chosen by Dezső Kováts 1992 for the lectotype, but I did not designate it as lectotype because it does not match the protologue (although it was sometime labelled with *Rubus hirtus* by Kitaibel). It lacks the dense violet glands typical of that species. The illustration (see below) of the protologue shows inflorescences with dense violet-reddish glands exactly as in “*Rubus hirtus* sensu Weihe & Nees” and in the view of all other authors. As long as no authentic specimen has been rediscovered matching the inflorescences in the protologue, in accordance with art. 8.1. the table can serve as the proper type superseding (according to art. 9.19) the typification by Kováts that is “in serious conflict with the protologue”.



Flowering and fruiting panicle of Rubus hirtus on table 141 in Waldstein & Kitaibel 1804

Accepted changes of names in current use:

New correct name replacing < NCU (name in current use)

Rubus bergeri Chamn. & Schltdl. ex Eckl. & Zeyh. < *Rubus vigorosus* P. J. Müll. & Wirtg.

Rubus umbrosus (Weihe & Nees) Arrh. < *Rubus pyramidalis* Kalt.

Rubus horrefactus P. J. Müll. & Lefèvre < *Rubus tuberculatus* Bab.

Rubus xidaeoides Ruthe < *Rubus xpseudoidaeus* (Weihe) Lej.

Not accepted changes of names in current use:

Maintained name < name used by A. van de Beek (2014b and <http://rubus-nederland.nl>)

Rubus praecox Bertoloni < *Rubus procerus* P. J. Müll. ex Boulay

Rubus laciniatus Willd.*) < *Rubus nemoralis* f. *laciniatus* (Willd.) A. Beek comb. illeg.

Rubus hermes Matzke-Hajek < *Rubus ambigens* (Boulay) Boulay: description does not match

Rubus hirtus Waldstein & Kitaibel < *Rubus melamporphyrus* A. Beek

Rubus pedemontanus Pinkw. < *Rubus bellardii* Weihe

Rubus calvus H. E. Weber < *Rubus calviformis* H. E. Weber

Rubus contractipes H. < *Rubus calvus* H. E. Weber

Rubus parahebecarpus H. E. Weber < *Rubus grandiflorus* Kalt.

*) Günter Matzke-Hajek has in a PDF file attached to his mail of 15th Sept 2014 convincingly pointed out that the name *Rubus laciniatus* Tollard 1805 was not validly published.

As stated before, changes of names for the series are regarded pointless, because there is a vast amount of names certainly with other ones having the priority. After a comprehensive nomenclatural revision of all these very many names for infrageneric taxa, the names used by van de Beek (2014b) will not all remain as the last solution. To my knowledge there is no interest outside NL to change the names in current use for these often artificial groups. Fortunately, there is an increasing trend in the botanical code to follow the zoological one, i.e. not to use the principle of priority to replace well known names in current use by long-forgotten older ones.

- Beek, A. van de 1974: Die Brombeeren des geldrischen Distriktes innerhalb der Flora der Niederlande. – Diss. Utrecht. 194 pps. Tilburg: H. Gianotten.
- Beek, A. van de (2014a): *Rubus costifolius* and *R. bergii* in the National Herbarium of Victoria. – *Muelleria* 32: 52–57.
- Beek, A. van de (2014b): Nomenclatorische en taxonomische toelichting up de naamlijst van de Nederlandse bramen (*Rubus* L.). – *Gorteria* 36: 172-193.
- Edees E. S. & Newton, A. (1988): *Brambles of the British Isles*. (Ed. D. H. Kent). 377 pps. + 98 tab. – London: The Ray Society.
- Kováts, D. (1992): Waldstein - Kitaibel típusok a MTM Növénytárában. – Magyar Természettudományi Múzeum Közlönye (Annales Historico-Naturales Musei Naturalis Hungarici) 84. 33-53.
- Weber, H. E. (1986): Zur Nomenklatur und Verbreitung der von K. E. A. Weihe aufgestellten Taxa der Gattung *Rubus* L. (Rosaceae). – *Bot. Jahrb. Syst.* 106: 289-335.