Of the "missing" botanical names published by Richard (or Guillemin), seven are generic, including the currently accepted *Cunninghamia* Rich. (*Cupressaceae*) and 12 are specific, one even published with a colour plate; information on these names is being sent to IPNI to set the record straight. *Marcgravia jacquinii* is one of the very few of these names that potentially disturbs currently accepted nomenclature and is dealt with here.

Richard (in Bory, l.c. 10: 165. 1826) prepared a generic entry for *Marcgravia* Plum. ex L. (*Marcgraviaceae*), apparently a precursor of a fuller study that was never published, so perhaps intended for the supplement that seems not to have appeared. So far unappreciated, it was here that Richard lectotypified Linnaeus's *Marcgravia umbellata* with the plate in Plumier's Nov. Pl. Amer.: 7, t. 29. 1703, over 150 years before Bedell in Howard, Fl. Lesser Antill. 5: 303. 1989 (see also Dressler in Bot. Mag., n.s. 14: 130–131. 1997). Richard went on to describe a species that had been confused with it, namely that depicted in Jacquin's *Selectarum stirpium Americanarum historia* (t. 96, drawn by Jacquin himself), naming it *M. jacquinii*, besides listing two other species (here nomina nuda) that he was intending to describe in the projected article. His *Marcgravia jacquinii* however, is accompanied by a diagnosis, besides his citation of Jacquin's plate and is validly published.

The Jacquin plate depicts the well-known species, *Marcgravia rectiflora* Triana & Planch. (in Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot., sér. 4, 17: 364. 1862), characterized by flowers being erect as opposed to angled at the pedicels as in *M. umbellata* L.

Curiously, Triana & Planchon (l.c.: 366) made the Jacquin plate the type of their *Marcgravia rectiflora* var. *jacquinii*. Besides this apparent coincidence (but was it?), we can find no other use of a '*jacquinii*' epithet in any published literature on the genus and so propose the rejection of *M. jacquinii*, which otherwise would take precedence over *M. rectiflora*, a species which is native in the Greater Antilles Cuba, Hispaniola, and Puerto Rico as well as in Tortola in the British Virgin Islands; it is also cultivated elsewhere as an ornamental climber.

Marcgravia rectiflora is the name used in a multitude of historic and recent publications including Wittmack in Martius, Fl. Bras. 12(1): 221, t. 40, fig. 2. 1878; Alain & Leon, Fl. Cuba 3: 299. 1953; Bailey Hortorium, Hortus Third: 713. 1976; Liogier & Martorell, Fl. Puerto Rico: System. Synopsis: 109. 1982; Liogier, Fl. Española 2: 282, fig. 84-1. 1983; Dressler in Taxon 46: 109. 1997, Fl. Rep. Cuba, Ser. A, 5(4): 10. 2000; Acevedo-Rodríguez, Bejucos Pl. Trepad. Puerto Rico: 317, fig. 2F, 124A–G. 2003, in Contr. U.S. Natl. Herb. 51: 310, fig. 124A–G. 2005; Axelrod in Sida Bot. Misc. 34: 210. 2011; Acevedo-Rodríguez & Strong in Smithsonian Contr. Bot. 98: 530. 2012; Greuter & Rankin Rodríguez, Espermat. Cuba Invent. Prelim. 2: 216. 2016; Mabberley's Plant-book, ed. 4: 564. 2017.

Acceptance of this proposal would ensure the continued use of the universally accepted name, *Marcgravia rectiflora*.

(2861) Proposal to conserve the name *Rubus ulmifolius* against *R. creticus*, *R. vulgaris*, and *R. inermis* (*Rosaceae*)

P. Pablo Ferrer-Gallego[1] & Abraham Van de Beek[2]

1 *Servicio de Vida Silvestre, Centro para la Investigación y la Experimentación Forestal (CIEF), Generalitat Valenciana, Avda. Comarques del País Valencià 114, 46930 Quart de Poblet, Valencia, Spain*

2 *Petenbos 8, 3904 BN Veenendaal, The Netherlands*

Address for correspondence: *P. Pablo Ferrer-Gallego, flora.cief@gva.es*

DOI https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12667

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2861) ***Rubus ulmifolius*** Schott in Erneuerte Vaterl. Blätt. Oesterr. Kaiserstaat 1818: 42. 7 Feb 1818 [Angiosp.: *Ros.*], nom. cons. prop.
Typus: "In sepibus maritimis Hispania, Schott" (W).

(=) *Rubus creticus* L., Fl. Palaest.: 21. 10 Mar 1756, nom. rej. prop.
Lectotypus (vide Van de Beek in Adansonia, sér. 3, 38: 46. 2016): Greece, Crete, *Tournefort 6073* (P-TRF 2D-code P00680425).

(=) *Rubus vulgaris* J. de Vries bis in Natuurk. Opheldernde Aanmerkingen 3: 196. 1779, nom. rej. prop.
Lectotypus (vide Van de Beek in Adansonia, sér. 3, 38: 36. 2016): [icon] "*Rubus*" in Matthioli, Comment. Secundo Aucti: 507. 1559. Epitypus (vide Ferrer-Gallego & Van de Beek in Phytotaxa 523: 157. 2021): Italy, Valgrisanche (Aosta), 3 Jul 1961, *Van Ooststroom 22933* (L No. 961. 290-325 [2D-code L.1907626]).

(=) *Rubus inermis* Pourr. in Hist. & Mém. Acad. Roy. Sci. Toulouse 3: 326. 1788, nom. rej. prop.
Lectotypus (vide Van de Beek in Gorteria 9: 206. 1979): Spain, Barcelona, *Pourret 3168* (MAF-POURR).

Rubus ulmifolius Schott (in Erneuerte Vaterl. Blätt. Oesterr. Kaiserstaat 1818: 42. 1818) is a very popular name for a well-known species of blackberries (subg. *Rubus*) with a wide distribution in Europe and North Africa (Great Britain, Ireland, The Netherlands, Germany, Luxembourg, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Slovenia, Croatia, Herzegovina, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Morocco, northern

Tunisia and Algeria, Canary Islands, Azores) and introduced to other parts of Central Europe, Denmark, south Sweden; Greece, Israel and some other eastern Mediterranean regions; North and South America, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand (Weber in Ill. Fl. Mitt.-Eur., ed. 3, 4(2A): 284–595. 1995; POWO, 2021, https://powo.science.kew.org/taxon/urn:lsid:ipni.org:names:740982-1). It is one of the few diploid *Rubus* species in Europe with great variability and many hybrids (Sennen, Diagn. Nouv.: 43. 1936, as '*R. gerundensis* grex *ulmifolius*'; Monasterio-Huelin & Weber in Edinburgh J. Bot. 53: 311–322. 1996; Monasterio-Huelin in Castroviejo & al., Fl. Iber. 6: 28–30. 1998). The name was lectotypified by Weber (Rubi Westfalici: 216. 1986) on a collection of Schott at W.

The variability of *Rubus ulmifolius* has resulted in the publication of many infraspecific taxa (see, e.g., Focke, Syn. Rub. Germ.: 177–186. 1877; Boulay in Rouy & Camus, Fl. France 6: 60–63. 1900; Focke in Ascherson & Graebner, Syn. Mitteleur. Fl. 6: 501–506. 1902; Sudre, Rubi Eur.: 69–77. 1909; Weber, l.c. 1986; Monasterio-Huelin & Weber, l.c.).

During the new critical research into the genus *Rubus* since the 1970s, two earlier names for the same species were discovered: *R. inermis* Pourr. (in Hist. & Mém. Acad. Roy. Sci. Toulouse 3: 326. 1788, see Van de Beek in Gorteria 9: 206. 1979; Ferrer-Gallego & Van de Beek in Phytotaxa 523: 160–163. 2021) and *R. vulgaris* J. de Vries bis (in Natuurk. Ophelderende Aanmerkingen 3: 196. 1779, see Van de Beek in Adansonia, sér. 3, 38: 36. 2016; Ferrer-Gallego & Van de Beek, l.c.: 157–158). [The designation "*R. non-spinosus* Ortega" (Fl. Españ. 6: 223, 524. 1784), although considered valid by Ferrer-Gallego & Van de Beek (l.c.: 158) was not validly published, not being accepted by Ortega (*ICN* Art. 36.1; Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018).] These names have never been in common use, *R. inermis* because Monasterio-Huelin & Weber (l.c.: 320) rejected the identification of *R. inermis* as unequivocally belonging to *R. ulmifolius*, *R. vulgaris* because it was published in an obscure publication and was discovered only recently. These observations would be sufficient for a proposal to conserve the name *R. ulmifolius*.

However, there is another reason. Some authors (Focke, l.c. 1902: 504 [as '*R. ulmifolius* subsp. *anatolicus* Focke']; Sudre, l.c.: 76; Juzepczuk in Komarov, Fl. USSR 10: 24. 1941; Parsa, Fl. de l'Iran 7: 105. 1948; Van de Beek, l.c. 2016: 46) conceive *Rubus ulmifolius* as conspecific with *R. sanctus* Schreb. (Icon. Descr. Pl.: 15, t. 8. 1766), a taxon with a wide distribution in the eastern Mediterranean area and the Near East. Fortunately, none of these authors has concluded that *R. ulmifolius* should be subsumed under *R. sanctus*, probably because of the popularity of the former name and because this would result in numerous new combinations and hybrid formulas. However, both *R. sanctus* and one of its synonyms, *R. parviflorus* Weston (Bot. Univ. 1: 258. 1770), are illegitimate superfluous names for the earlier *R. creticus* L. (Fl. Palaest.: 15. 1756) and thus unavailable (Art. 52.3; see Ferrer-Gallego & Van de Beek, l.c.: 156). Among all these names, *R. creticus* has priority and should be the correct name at species rank, but this name has never been in use.

In conclusion, as was mentioned by Van de Beek (l.c. 1979, 2016), Van de Beek & Widrlechner (in Adansonia, sér. 3, 43: 82. 2021), and Ferrer-Gallego & Van de Beek (l.c.), the names *R. creticus*, *R. inermis*, and *R. vulgaris* have priority over *R. ulmifolius*. However, they also argue that a proposal for conservation of the name *R. ulmifolius* should be submitted, since all contemporary authors agree that the other names should not be used, reviving any of them would introduce a potentially confusing name change for no good purpose. Consequently, to preserve nomenclatural stability and support the continued and well-established use of the name *R. ulmifolius*, we propose to conserve the name *R. ulmifolius* against *R. creticus*, *R. inermis*, and *R. vulgaris* under Art. 14 of the *ICN*.

Rejection of the present proposal would have an undesirable consequence because the well-known name *Rubus ulmifolius* would be replaced by the hardly known name *R. creticus*. In addition, rejection of the proposal would require numerous new combinations of the names currently included in *R. ulmifolius* as infraspecific taxa, and new hybrid formulas. Moreover, the identity of *R. creticus* (≡ *R. sanctus*, nom. illeg.) with *R. ulmifolius* is still a matter of debate (vide Monasterio-Huelin & Weber, l.c., as '*R. sanctus*'). If the proposal would be rejected, there is a risk that the name of the species now known as *R. ulmifolius* (and all taxa related to it) would fluctuate depending on taxonomic interpretations.

Author information

PPFG, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7595-9302

AVDB, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6728-9572

Acknowledgements

We thank the staff of the cited herbaria, especially José Pizarro (MAF), and Neus Ibáñez (BC). Thanks to Dr. John Wiersema and Dr. John McNeill for their advice, assistance, and valuable comments that improved this proposal.