

Notes on British *Rubi*, 3

E. S. EDEES

23 Dartmouth Avenue, Newcastle, Staffs.

ABSTRACT

The brambles comprising the section *Triviales* P. J. Muell. are reviewed and those described by British authors typified. The taxa *R. wahlbergii* Arrhen., *R. purpureicaulis* W. C. R. Wats., *R. scabrosus* P. J. Muell. and *R. myriacanthus* Focke are removed from the British list, *R. dumetorum* var. *triangularis* A. Ley is raised to specific rank, and two new species are described, viz. *R. hebridensis* from western Scotland and *R. bagnallianus* from central England.

INTRODUCTION

The object of this paper is to clarify the taxonomy of the section *Triviales* P. J. Muell. of the *Rubus* list in Dandy (1958) and Watson (1958) by typifying the British species and examining the application of the names one by one. But before beginning with the numbered names in the British list it is necessary to consider two which have been used as aggregates.

SPECIES COLLECTIVAE

Rubus corylifolius Sm., Fl. Brit., 2: 542 (1800)

It is not known with certainty what J. E. Smith meant by *R. corylifolius*. I have seen no specimen collected by him or named by him before 1800, though there are two in LINN dated 1801 from Shropshire collected by E. Williams. One of these is certainly *R. sublustris* Lees and the other is very like the strongly-armed bramble which J. B. L. Warren called *R. diversifolius* Lindl. and which (see below) is taken to be *R. tuberculatus* Bab. Smith expressed some doubt about the former, thinking it 'nearest *caesius*', but he determined the latter *R. corylifolius* without qualification. A third specimen in LINN comes from Henfield, W. Sussex, v.c. 13, and is undated. This has been named 'good *corylifolius*' by 'E.F.' and is *R. sublustris*. The initials J.E.S. appear on the sheet without comment. From this evidence it would seem that *R. corylifolius*, as Smith originally understood it, covered the whole section. Watson (1948, p. 622) reached a similar conclusion after reading Smith's descriptions of 1800 and 1824.

C. C. Babington, however, thought *R. corylifolius* was *R. sublustris*. He said (1869, p. 264): 'The true *R. sublustris* is exactly the typical *R. corylifolius*.' Later in a letter to T. R. Archer Briggs, dated 30 August 1888, he wrote (A. M. Babington 1897, p. 420): 'There seems to be no doubt about the *sublustris*. It has always been well known to me, the common and typical *corylifolius* of Smith. He may have included other things under the name, as I have done, but the figure and description are conclusive as to the original plant intended.'

Smith's original description is short but in my judgement, when supplemented by his later and longer description in the *English Flora* (1824), points at least in

the direction of *R. sublustris*. The statement (1824) however that the leaflets are 'often precisely like hazel leaves' is not how we should describe the terminal leaflet of typical *R. sublustris*. The drawing of *R. corylifolius* in the *English Flora* shows the hazel-like leaflet very well and to that extent is unlike *R. sublustris*. But it is much further removed from the strongly-armed taxa of this section.

It was no doubt because Smith 'included other things under the name' that E. Lees described part of *R. corylifolius* as a new species. He said in a note on a specimen named *R. sublustris* in CGE: '*R. corylifolius* Sm., in part, but con-founded by him with *R. dumetorum* W. & N.'

Rubus dumetorum Weihe ex Boenn., Prodr. Fl. Monast., 153 (1824)

LECTOTYPUS: 'Herb. Weihe, *Rubus dumetorum* Nr. I, im Landesmus. für Naturwissensch. in Münster.' (Beek 1974)

W. M. Rogers (1900) divided the British taxa of the *Triviales* section, with the exception of *R. balfourianus* Bloxam ex Bab., into two groups, viz. those which had scattered subequal prickles and few glandular hairs, and those which had many unequal prickles, acicles and gland-tipped hairs. The former he placed under *R. corylifolius* as a collective species and the latter under *R. dumetorum* as another collective species. Watson (1946, 1958) rejected this arrangement, but it was useful. Any bramble of the *Triviales* section which could not be more exactly named went usually without difficulty into the one or the other of these aggregate slots. But Rogers misunderstood *R. dumetorum*, deceived no doubt by the illustrations in Weihe & Nees' *Rubi Germanici* (1822-27), which point to a strongly-armed taxon, and the placing there of *R. ferox* Weihe ex Boenn. as a variety of *R. dumetorum*.

I have not seen the type specimen of *R. dumetorum*, but Prof. H. E. Weber has sent me recently-collected specimens which he says match it well. These make it plain that *R. dumetorum sensu stricto* is a weakly-armed bramble at the opposite pole to *R. ferox*, which according to the original description (1824) has a stem 'undique horridus'. Prof. Weber's specimens are close to *R. caesius* L. and unlike any British bramble I have seen named *R. dumetorum*. Weihe & Nees (1827) said *R. dumetorum* var. *vulgaris* Weihe & Nees was very like *R. corylifolius*, of which they claimed to have seen authentic specimens, but differed from it in having erect sepals. The original description of *R. dumetorum* is vague: 'Foliola lateralia sessilia; flores corymbosi, albi vel rosei. Caulis respectu armationis variabilis.' This allows and was given a wide interpretation.

THE BRITISH LIST

1. *Rubus conjungens* (Bab.) J. B. L. Warren, Fl. Cheshire, 115 (1899)

R. corylifolius var. *conjungens* Bab., Man. Brit. Bot., ed. 3, 103 (1851)

LECTOTYPUS: Bembridge, Isle of Wight, v.c. 10, 1845, *T. Bell Salter* (CGE)

Widespread and when typical easily distinguished from *R. sublustris* Lees by its angled stems, strong prickles, leaflets without lobes and pink flowers.

2. *Rubus hebridensis* E. S. Edees, sp. nov.

Turiones ex arcu humili decumbentes, glabri, atropurpurei, nitentes. Aculei subaequales (5–7 mm longi), declinati, ad angulos dispositi.

Folia quinata, digitata. Foliola superene atroviridia et glabrescentia, subtus cinereo-tomentosa, grosse serrata, ad marginem undulata, imbricata. Foliola infima subsessilia petiolulis usque ad 2mm longis. Foliolum terminale late ellipticum (9 × 7 cm), interdum lobatum, breviter acuminatum et basi rotundatum, petiolulo proprio quadruplo vel etiam quintuplo longius. Petioli purpurei, nitentes, aculeis declinatis vel paulo curvatis muniti. Stipulae lineares pilis glandulosis breviter fimbriatae.

Rami floriferi atrovirentes, superne pilis adpressis patentibusque vestiti, nonnunquam pedicellis bracteisque brevissime et raro glandulosis, inferne subglabri. Aculei e basi valida declinati vel paulo falcati, irregulariter dispositi. Inflorescentiae foliosae ad apicem corymbosae ramulis floriferis brevibus e foliorum summorum axillis ortis instructae.

Sepala reflexa. Petala subrosea. Carpella pilosa.

Low arching. Stems dark shining purple, glabrous. Prickles on angles, subequal (5–7 mm long), declining.

Leaves quinate, digitate. Leaflets dark green and glabrescent above, greenish white and velvety soft beneath, coarsely and unevenly toothed, undulate at the margin, imbricate. Basal leaflets subsessile with stalks up to 2 mm long. Terminal leaflet broadly elliptic (9 × 7 cm), sometimes lobate, with short acuminate point and rounded base. Petiolule $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{5}$ as long as the blade. Petioles shining purple, armed with declining or slightly curved prickles. Stipules linear, fringed with very short glandular hairs.

Flowering stems dark purple, clothed with adpressed and spreading hairs at the top, with sometimes a few subsessile glandular hairs on the pedicels and bracts, subglabrous below. Prickles declining or slightly curved from a strong base, unevenly spaced. Panicles leafy with a corymbose top and clusters of flowers on short peduncles in the axils of the leaves below.

Sepals reflexed. Petals pinkish. Carpels pilose.

HOLOTYPE: Gourock, Renfrew, v.c. 76, 1845, *F. Adamson*, herb. Babington 240 (CGE)

Babington named Adamson's bramble, which is a good specimen mounted on two sheets, *R. corylifolius* var. *conjungens* Bab. and Rogers concurred. But it is a very different taxon. The following note written by the collector accompanies the specimen and illustrates its salient points: 'Distinguished by its glabrous stems, dark purple and shining as if varnished, by its wavy concave glossy leaves, its corymbose panicle with pinkish flowers; and the hairs present on the fruit of all the varieties in a young state are more or less persistent on this. This seems to me a very distinct species. I have only noticed it at Gourock along the shore and in Arran. Fruit luscious, large grained.' It appears to be frequent on the western coast of Scotland. I saw it growing in Kintyre in 1972 and have specimens from the Mull of Kintyre, v.c. 101, collected by A. G. Kenneth in 1972, and others from several places in the Island of Arran, v.c. 100, collected by Miss U. K. Duncan in 1961 and D. E. Allen in 1965. B. A. Miles found it in Skye, v.c. 104, in 1966 and A. Newton tells me there is a specimen in MANCH from South Harris, v.c. 110, collected by W. A. Shoolbred in 1894.

3. *Rubus ooliticus* W. C. R. Wats., *Watsonia*, 3: 286 (1956)

R. corylifolius var. *calcareus* Rogers ex Riddelsd., *J. Bot.*, Lond., 58: 104 (1920)

LECTOTYPUS: Near Cold Aston (Aston Blank), E. Gloucester, v.c. 33, 16/7/1913, *Mary A. Rogers* (BM)

This is close to *R. conjugens* and deserves more study in the field. But it is not identical with *R. purpureicaulis* W. C. R. Wats., which (see below) is taken to be an extreme form of *R. conjugens*. Riddelsdell (1920, 1948) recorded it for several places in the Cotswolds and I have seen it at Aston Blank, GR 42/13.19. A specimen in my herbarium from Velvet Valley, Charterhouse, GR 31/4.5, N. Somerset, v.c. 6, collected by Watson in 1951, seems to be intermediate between *R. ooliticus* and *R. sublustris*.

4. *Rubus eboracensis* W. C. R. Wats., *Watsonia*, 3: 286 (1956)

HOLOTYPUS: Sowerby, N. E. Yorks., v.c. 62, 27/7/1937, *W. C. R. Watson* (BM)

This is allied to *R. conjugens* and *R. sublustris* but distinguished from both by its rhomboidal terminal leaflets. It is widespread and constant in the north of England and has been recorded from the following vice counties: 27, 39, 40, 53–58, 60, 62, 64–68, 70, 77.

5. *Rubus sublustris* Lees in Steele, *Handb. Field Bot.*, 54 (1847)

R. warmingii G. Jensen ex Frid. & Gel. var. *glaber* (Frid. & Gel.) Weber, *Rubus Nordwest. Eur.*, 352 (1972)

LECTOTYPUS: Wellington, Salop, v.c. 40, 7/1842, *H. Bidwell* (K)

The lectotype was originally named '*Rubus affinis* var. *c*', but this (except the first word) was crossed out and '*sublustris* Lees' MSS' substituted in the handwriting of Edwin Lees. This is a satisfactory specimen of what we have come to understand by *R. sublustris*, the bramble distinguished by its round or roundish stem, slender, purple-based prickles, lobed terminal leaflets and white petals. There is another, but undated, specimen from Wellington, Salop, v.c. 40, collected by Bidwell, in Babington's herbarium (CGE) and Lees has written on the sheet 'Only a more robust form of *sublustris* as proved by barren stem'. This specimen is identical with the lectotype. But a specimen in CGE collected by Lees himself at Temple Laughern, Henwick, near Worcester, v.c. 37, in July 1846 is not. The stem is more distinctly angular, the prickles numerous and strong and the terminal leaflet does not show the characteristic humping. It seems plain that Lees took a wider view of *R. sublustris* than his successors did and may have included in his concept of the species the taxon now called *R. conjugens*, a possibility which is supported by his remark in a later account (1852) that some varieties have purple flowers. There is nothing in the short original account to exclude *R. sublustris* as now understood, except perhaps the statement that the stems are angled. But this is offset by the note on Bidwell's

Wellington specimen in CGE, where Lees says the identity of the plant is proved by the barren stem. In this specimen the stem is bluntly angled, as it often is in taxa which are said to have roundish stems.

It was W. A. Leighton (1841, 1848) who first accurately and fully described the bramble typified by Bidwell's Wellington specimen. In 1841 he called it *R. affinis* W. & N. var. *c.* Then Lees gave him the Temple Laughern specimen with a reference to his description in Steele's *Handbook*. Leighton was not quite satisfied with the specimen, for he could only say (1848) 'It seems generally referrible [*sic*] here.' But he adopted Lees' name 'to avoid the addition of new names in a genus already encumbered with them.' There is a specimen in **K**, collected by Leighton near Shrewsbury in 1849, which matches the lectotype well and shows how Leighton interpreted *R. sublustris*. He was followed by Babington (1869), Rogers (1900) and Watson (1958). The intention in designating the Wellington rather than the Temple Laughern specimen as lectotype is to maintain this tradition. What the Temple Laughern specimen is or whether it deserves a separate name is not known.

R. sublustris as now typified is well defined and widely distributed both in this country and on the Continent. Prof. Weber tells me (1974 *in litt.*) that it is common in Schleswig-Holstein. It is described in his book (1972) as *R. warmingii* var. *glaber*.

6. *Rubus latifolius* Bab., Man. Brit. Bot., ed. 3, 94 (1851)

LECTOTYPUS: By the river above Cramond Bridge near Edinburgh, v.c. 83, 28/8/1845, C. C. Babington 79 (CGE)

Easily recognised when typical by its white petals, patent sepals and cordate-ovate, incised terminal leaflets. But plants are often found, especially near the sea, with abnormally large petals and imperfect fruit. These seem to be recent hybrids with *R. caesius*. *R. latifolius* has been recorded for the following vice counties: 60, 68–70, 81–85, 88, 90, 93, 95, 96, 99, 101, 107–109. The lectotype was designated by Barton & Riddelsdell (1932).

7. *Rubus bucknallii* J. W. White, J. Bot., Lond., 37: 389 (1899)

LECTOTYPUS: Westridge Wood, near Wotton-under-Edge, W. Gloucester, v.c. 34, 7/1898, J. W. White (BRIST)

This appears to be a very local bramble and may be restricted to Westridge Wood, GR 31/75.95, and its vicinity. All the specimens I have seen from this locality are conspecific, but specimens from other places are either atypical or incorrect. There are good specimens in **BRIST** from Westridge Wood gathered by C. Bucknall in 1899, D. Fry in 1898 and J. W. White in 1897 and 1898. But a specimen from near Mordiford, Hereford, v.c. 36, collected by A. Ley in 1899 is incorrect, though confirmed by White himself (1901). The leaflets differ in shape, texture and tothing from those of *R. bucknallii* and the sepals are erect in fruit, as is more plainly shown on specimens of the same taxon in **BIRM**. Another specimen in **BRIST** gathered by H. J. Riddelsdell in 1919 from Ballards Copse, Heyford, Oxford, v.c. 23, is also wrong. The most prominent feature of *R. bucknallii* is the densely hairy stem.

8. *Rubus umbelliformis* Muell. & Lefèv., Pollichia, **16-17**: 265 (1859)

The bramble of south-eastern England to which Watson gave this name has a distinct appearance. I have seen it growing on Shooters Hill, W. Kent, v.c. 16. But the only French specimen I have examined, an example of Sudre's *Batotheca Europaea* no. 669 in **BM**, is insufficient by itself to prove whether Watson was right or wrong. The name should be retained for the time being.

9. *Rubus balfourianus* Bloxam ex Bab., Ann. Nat. Hist., **19**: 86 (1847)

LECTOTYPUS: Near Rugby, Warwick, v.c. 38, 1846, *A. Bloxam* (no. 10), herb. Babington (**CGE**)

This is an easily recognised bramble with a wide distribution in the Midlands and southern England. It occurs also on the Continent. There is a specimen in **BM** from Silesia collected by H. Kinscher in 1908 (Sudre's *Batotheca Europaea* no. 668), which tallies exactly with the British plant. Prof. Weber tells me (1974 *in litt.*) that it is one of the most widely distributed brambles in central Europe. We have exchanged specimens and agree that the German and English plants are the same. But there is some doubt about the name. According to Weber the correct name is *R. nemorosus* Hayne ex Willd., *Berlinische Baumzucht*, ed. 2, 411 (1811), and it is under this name that the bramble has generally been recorded on the Continent. The difficulty is that the earliest description of *R. nemorosus* is too brief to be adequate and Hayne's original specimens have not been seen and may have been destroyed. However the plate which accompanies F. G. Hayne's description of his bramble (1813) is on the whole a good representation of what in this country has been called *R. balfourianus*, though the anthers are shown as glabrous and the petals entire. But Weber tells me that the anthers are normally pilose in Germany as in England and Hayne's description, that of 1811 being simply an earlier printing of the description of 1813, states that the petals are sometimes emarginate. It seems very probable that when *R. nemorosus* has been typified the later name *R. balfourianus* will have to be discarded.

10. *Rubus warrenii* Sudre, Rubi Eur., 240 (1913)

R. dumetorum var. *concinus* Baker ex J. B. L. Warren, J. Bot., Lond., **8**: 169 (1870)

LECTOTYPUS: Trout Hall, Plumley, Cheshire, v.c. 58, 9/1869, *J. B. L. Warren* (**DBN**)

There are three specimens in Warren's herbarium from Trout Hall which are undoubtedly conspecific. Those issued in the Set of British Rubi (no. 132) from Bradley, Derbyshire, v.c. 57, 1896, W. R. Linton, match the type well. *R. warrenii* is still common in Plumley Lane and neighbouring parts of Cheshire and is locally common in the north of Staffordshire and in Derbyshire. There are also specimens in Warren's herbarium from Twycross, Leicester, v.c. 55, and Thirsk, N.E. Yorks., v.c. 62, the latter collected by J. G. Baker in 1870.

There is a more recent specimen from Thirsk in CGE collected by W. H. Mills in 1963.

11. *Rubus adenoleucus* Chaboiss., Bull. Soc. bot. Fr., 7: 267 (1860)

A French specimen in BM, a sheet of Sudre's Batotheca Europaea no. 716, has been examined. It was gathered by T. Chaboisseau himself at Pindray, the *locus classicus*, in 1861 and can be accepted as authentic. Watson (1958) claimed that *R. adenoleucus* was frequent in the south-east of England. I have seen specimens determined by him from Finchley Common, Middlesex, v.c. 21; Wisley Common, Surrey, v.c. 17; Benhall Mill Lane, Tunbridge Wells, E. Sussex, v.c. 14; and Whitcliff, Ludlow, Salop, v.c. 40; but none of these matches the French specimen. However a specimen in CGE from Meroow Downs, Guildford, Surrey, collected by J. E. Woodhead in 1937, apparently does. The label does not say whether it was submitted to Watson or collected in his company.

12. *Rubus wahlbergii* Arrhen., Rub. Suec. Monogr., 43 (1839)

Watson (1946, 1958) recorded this for only one British locality, but his specimen from Grisling Common, Piltown, E. Sussex, v.c. 14, collected in 1952 and now in my possession, does not comply perfectly with the original description. In particular the presence of numerous acicles and glandular hairs on the barren stem is out of character.

13. *Rubus halsteadensis* W. C. R. Wats., Watsonia, 3: 286 (1956)

R. dumetorum var. *raduliformis* A. Ley, J. Bot., Lond., 42: 120 (1904)

LECTOTYPUS: Lane side, Beacon Hill, Trelleck, Monmouth, v.c. 35, 4/7/1893, A. Ley (BIRM)

There are early specimens in Ley's herbarium (BIRM) from the three localities mentioned in the protologue, viz. Trelleck, Monmouth, v.c. 35; Loggerheads, near Mold, Flint, v.c. 51; and Halstead, W. Kent, v.c. 16. The specimen from Loggerheads, dated 1898, is the only one named *R. dumetorum* var. *raduliformis* by Ley, but unfortunately the pieces on the sheet are unmounted and may be mixed. One panicle has densely hairy carpels, which contradicts the statement in the original description that the young carpels are glabrous. A pencilled note by Ley says 'Near the Beacon Hill plant.' The specimen from Trelleck, though not named, was mounted by Ley and labelled in his handwriting. It answers his description well and notes on the sheet stating the colour of the petals and the colour and relative lengths of the stamens and styles are reflected in the original description. The third specimen bears a label in the handwriting of W. M. Rogers who collected it at Halstead, W. Kent, in 1899 and sent it to Ley as an unnamed variety of *R. dumetorum*. This differs in having a terminal leaflet which is, to quote Watson (1958), 'broad ovate, triangular-acuminate'. It may be that *R. halsteadensis* in its typical form is a local Monmouthshire species.

There are specimens in Ley's herbarium from many English and Welsh localities, but few of them match the lectotype closely. The Halstead bramble is a related but different taxon and probably deserves a new name. I have seen it at Chislehurst and Watson (1935, p. 65) described it as abundant in the London district. But it has not been recently studied in the field.

14. *Rubus purpureicaulis* W. C. R. Wats., *Watsonia*, 1: 290 (1950)

R. corylifolius var. *purpureus* Bab., *Man. Brit. Bot.*, ed. 3, 103 (1851)

LECTOTYPUS: Crow Meole, near Shrewsbury, Salop, v.c. 40, 1846, *W. A. Leighton*, herb. Babington (CGE)

R. corylifolius var. *purpureus* Bab. seems hardly distinguishable from *R. corylifolius* var. *conjungens* Bab. (*R. conjungens* (Bab.) J. B. L. Warren). A comparison of the original descriptions shows that var. *purpureus* has a purple rather than a green stem, fine rather than coarse leaf tothing, a flexuose instead of a straight rachis and many rather than few rachis prickles. But a comparison of the syntypes of both taxa does not bear this out. The lectotype of var. *conjungens* has a strongly armed, flexuose rachis and a reddish purple stem and there is not much difference in the shape and tothing of the leaflets. The lectotype of var. *purpureus* has a compound panicle, strong patent prickles and scattered short acicles and some very short glandular hairs on the stem and rachis. But there are several sheets from Shrewsbury named var. *purpureus* which seem to differ from typical var. *conjungens* only in the purple colour of the stem. On one of these the word '*purpureus*' has been crossed out and the word '*conjungens*' written below with the approval of Rogers. It seems best to regard var. *purpureus* (*R. purpureicaulis*) as a strong, purple-tinted form of var. *conjungens* (*R. conjungens*), at least for the time being. What is needed is a careful study of the living bushes near Shrewsbury. A search in 1974 was unsuccessful. I have not seen many specimens determined by Watson, but those from Chailey, E. Sussex, v.c. 14, and Finchley Wood, Middlesex, v.c. 21, are not identical with the lectotype.

Babington had second thoughts about *R. purpureicaulis* in his later years. In SHD there is a specimen of a bramble collected by J. E. Bagnall at Minworth, Warwick, v.c. 38, in 1879, which Babington confirmed as *R. corylifolius* var. *purpureus*, but which is very different from the Shrewsbury plants to which he originally gave the name. This may have been the bramble Babington (1886, p. 235) had in mind when he decided that his *R. corylifolius* var. *purpureus* was identical with *R. fasciculatus* P. J. Muell. It was certainly the bramble Rogers (1900) described under that name and distributed as no. 50 in the Set of British Rubi. But Sudre (1904), Watson (1928) and W. C. Barton (manuscript notes) rejected the identification, and to judge from the original description of *R. fasciculatus* and Barton's photographs of specimens collected by Mueller they were justified.

What then is the Minworth bramble to be called? Watson (1950) thought it was *R. babingtonianus* W. C. R. Wats., but it bears no resemblance to the lectotype of that taxon in CGE. There is, however, an earlier name to be considered. Sudre (1904) determined the sheet of no. 50 of the Set of British Rubi which

came to him as *R. × legrandianus* Sudre (*R. adscitus* Genev. \times *R. caesius* L.) and (1913) identified it with a specimen in herb. Boreau to which he had originally given that name. I have not seen Boreau's specimen, but the original description (1902) does not apply well to the British plant. In the British plant the leaves are not ternate, the leaflets are not more deeply incised than those of *R. adscitus*, the stem is not very hairy, the inflorescence is not short and corymbose and the rachis and pedicels have at least as many acicles and glandular hairs as are present in *R. adscitus*. Moreover the British plant is not more likely than any other bramble to be of hybrid origin and deserves recognition at full specific rank. It is therefore described below as a new species.

15. *Rubus bagnallianus* E. S. Deebs, sp. nov.

Turiones in apricis purpurascetes, primo pilis brevibus simplicibus stellatisque sparsim vestiti, demum glabrescentes. Aculei multi, tenues, declinati, diametro caulis raro longiores. Glanduli stipitati pauci, aciculi breves numerosi.

Folia quinata. Foliola supra glabrescentia, infra molliter pilosa, duplicato-serrata. Foliola infima sessilia. Foliolum terminale late ovatum, acuminatum, basi subcuneatum, petiolulo proprio triplo longius.

Rami floriferi purpurascetes, aculeis numerosis parum declinatis muniti, pilis simplicibus stellatisque vestiti, aculeolis brevibus increbre et glandulis breviter stipitatis hinc illinc instructi. Folia ternata. Inflorescentiae usque ad apicem foliiferae, cylindricae. Ramuli inferiores ascendentes foliis breviores.

Sepala plus minusve inermia, nonnunquam attenuata, reflexa. Petala lata, laete subrosea. Stamina alba stylos virides superantia.

Stems becoming purple in exposure, clothed with scattered, short, simple and stellate hairs at first, a few short glandular hairs and many short acicles, glabrescent. Prickles many, slender, declining, rarely longer than the diameter of the stem.

Leaves quinately compound. Leaflets glabrescent above, soft with white adpressed hairs beneath, coarsely serrate. Basal leaflets sessile. Terminal leaflet broadly ovate or slightly obovate, acuminate, narrowed to the base, three times as long as its petiolule.

Flowering branches becoming purple, armed with many slightly declining prickles and clothed with simple and stellate hairs, scattered short glandular hairs and numerous short acicles. Leaves ternate. Panicles leafy almost to the summit, cylindrical, with ascending lower branches shorter than the subtending leaves.

Sepals almost unarmed, sometimes with a long tip, reflexed. Petals broad, bright pink. Stamens white, longer than the green styles.

HOLOTYPE: Hedges, Curdworth, Warwick, v.c. 38, 2/8/1892, *J. E. Bagnall* as *R. corylifolius* var. *fasciculatus* P. J. Muell. Set of British Rubi no. 50 (CGE)

This bramble is frequent between Birmingham and Tamworth, especially about Minworth, and extends north at least as far as Shirley, near Ashbourne, Derbyshire, v.c. 57.

16. *Rubus tuberculatus* Bab., Fl. Cambridge, 306 (1860)

LECTOTYPUS: Red Hill, near Shrewsbury, Salop, v.c. 40, 1847, *W. A. Leighton*, herb. Babington 468 (CGE)

There is no real difference between the bramble common about Tabley, Cheshire, which Warren (1870) called *R. diversifolius* Lindl. and Watson (1946, 1958) *R. myriacanthus* Focke, and the bramble common about Shrewsbury, which Babington named *R. tuberculatus*. Babington (1869, p. 220) admitted a close resemblance, even though he felt justified in placing *R. diversifolius* among the *Glandulosi* and *R. tuberculatus* with the *Caesii* (Watson's *Triviales*). There is a remarkable correspondence between Babington's description of *R. tuberculatus* in *British Rubi* (1869) and Warren's (1870) description of *R. diversifolius*. Both are detailed and accurate. Both mention the reddish colour of the stems, the swollen bases of the prickles, the preponderance of ternate leaves, the somewhat oblong or quadrangular terminal leaflets, dull green and rugose above and hairy on the veins beneath, the short leafy panicles, the erect sepals and the broad jagged petals. The only clearly stated difference seems to be that Babington said the petals are pinkish and Warren that they are white. Babington made no mention of the flower colour in his original description.

Warren understood the Tabley *R. diversifolius* well enough to place it in the section *Caesii*, but he thought the name *R. tuberculatus*, which he acknowledged to be a 'somewhat large species' (1869, p. 100), applied best to a bramble from Sheen Common and Kilburn near London with rose-coloured petals. But specimens of this bramble in his collection are quite unlike those from Shrewsbury which Babington used for his original description of *R. tuberculatus* and Warren said he had not seen it in Cheshire. Warren (1869, p. 100) spoke of 'the common hedge bramble of Cheshire, York and Shropshire' as though there were only one. A careful comparison of Babington's specimens of *R. tuberculatus* from Shrewsbury with the numerous Cheshire specimens labelled *R. diversifolius* in Warren's herbarium in **DBN**, combined with field observations in 1974, confirms this statement.

The correct name for this bramble is *R. tuberculatus* Bab. The earlier name *R. diversifolius* Lindl. was misapplied and must in any case be rejected as illegitimate, the holotype in **CGE** being a specimen of *R. vestitus* Weihe & Nees. *R. myriacanthus* Focke is a later name, which Focke (1871) proposed as a substitute for *R. diversifolius* Lindl.

R. tuberculatus is a variable taxon, but well-grown bushes are distinguished by their compact heads of large, white flowers. It is abundant in Cheshire and Shropshire and common in Staffordshire and extends south through the Cotswolds to Cornwall and north at least into Yorkshire.

17. *Rubus babingtonianus* W. C. R. Wats., J. Ecol., 33: 342 (1946)

R. althaeifolius sensu Bab., Fl. Cambridge, 305 (1860), non Host

LECTOTYPUS: Chesterton, Cambridge, v.c. 29, 7/9/1849, *C. C. Babington* 254 (CGE)

There are specimens in Babington's herbarium (CGE) from all the places

listed in his *British Rubi* (1869), but they are not all correctly determined. The Cambridgeshire localities are the most reliable. Specimens from near Balsar's Hill, Chesterton, Comberton, Eversden and Snailwell tally with the description and match one another. Further afield some of the specimens sent by J. G. Baker from Thirsk, N.E. Yorks, v.c. 62, may be correct and so may a specimen from near Goldings, Herts., v.c. 20, collected by W. H. Coleman in 1843 as *R. caesius*. *R. babingtonianus*, with its many flowers and fascicled pedicels, looks like a recent hybrid with *R. caesius* and hardly worth a name. Specimens in CGE from Squerryes Park, Westerham, W. Kent, v.c. 16, collected by Watson in 1939 and 1947 are incorrectly determined and so is one from Westend Common, Surrey, v.c. 17, collected by W. H. Mills.

18. *Rubus rubriflorus* Purchas, J. Bot., Lond., 32: 187 (1894)

R. rubicundus Purchas, J. Bot., Lond., 32: 139 (1894) non Müller & Wirtgen.

No specimen named *R. rubriflorus* by Purchas before 1894 has yet been seen. But it cannot be said that none exists and for that reason I refrain from designating a lectotype. There is however an excellent specimen in BIRM, named *R. rosaceus* Weihe, which can be cited as representative. It has a label in the handwriting of Purchas who tells us that he collected it from a hedge between Ashbourne and Osmaston, Derby, v.c. 57, in 1891. These places are mentioned in the protologue and this may well have been one of the specimens Purchas had before him when he described his species. It is certainly *R. rubriflorus*, which before 1894 was sometimes thought to be a form of *R. rosaceus*. A note by W. R. Linton (1891) on undetermined specimens collected at Edlaston and Yeaveley, two other localities mentioned in the protologue, and distributed through the Botanical Exchange Club mentions the pink petals, pink filaments and red styles and the convex leaflets, which are characteristic of *R. rubriflorus*, and states that both Babington and Rogers thought the plant was related to *R. rosaceus*. *R. rubriflorus* is a well-marked species of local distribution in Derbyshire and Cheshire.

19. *Rubus scabrosus* P. J. Muell., Flora (Regensb.), 41: 185 (1858)

This was Watson's name for the bramble which Rogers (1900) had taken to be *R. dumetorum* var. *ferox* Weihe. But Watson misunderstood *R. scabrosus*. He (1958) described the prickles as being very crowded and a specimen of his from Shirley Hills, W. Kent, v.c. 16, in my herbarium has the densest array of prickles of all sizes on the stem. In this respect it is quite different from a French specimen in BM (Sudre's Batotheca Europaea no. 702) from Wissembourg, Bas Rhin, collected by Mueller in 1858, on which the main prickles are well spaced. Specimens from Bournemouth, S. Hants., v.c. 11, which were distributed as no. 49 in the Set of British *Rubi* under the name '*R. dumetorum* W. & N. var. *ferox* Weihe', are probably neither *R. scabrosus* nor *R. dumetorum* var. *ferox*. Brambles belonging to the section *Triviales* which have strongly armed stems are very common, but few of them can be determined at present.

20. *Rubus britannicus* Rogers, J. Bot., Lond., 32: 49 (1894)

LECTOTYPUS: Munstead, Surrey, v.c. 17, 8/7/1891, W. M. Rogers (BM)

A local bramble, in its typical form perhaps restricted to Munstead.

21. *Rubus tenuiarmatus* Lees, Bot. Malv. Hills, ed. 2, 51 (1852)

LECTOTYPUS: Bromsgrove Lickey, Worcester, v.c. 37, 3/10/1850, *W. Mathews*, herb. Babington 263 (CGE)

This is said to grow in hedges and thickets about Great Malvern, but the type specimen is the only one I have seen. It was named by Lees and is no doubt the authentic specimen mentioned by Babington (1869, p. 257).

22. *Rubus triangularis* (A. Ley) E. S. Edees, **comb. et stat. nov.**

R. dumetorum var. *triangularis* A. Ley, J. Bot., Lond., 40: 69 (1902)

LECTOTYPUS: Sapey Common, Hereford, v.c. 36, 16/8/1898, *A. Ley* (BIRM)

Watson (1946) identified this with *R. tenuiarmatus* Lees, but there are vital differences between the original descriptions of the two brambles. Lees (1852) said the stem prickles of *R. tenuiarmatus* are scattered, slender, very weak and break at the slightest touch, whereas Ley said that those of his plant were crowded and very stout. A second difference is in the number of leaflets, the leaves of *R. tenuiarmatus* being quinate, those of *R. triangularis* ternate or ternate-lobate but 'not quinate'. The specimen of *R. tenuiarmatus* in CGE is plainly different from *R. triangularis*. This is another very local bramble, but it is still common in the Teme valley above and below Stanford Bridge, Worcester, v.c. 37, and no doubt at Upper Sapey as well, though I have not looked for it there. The triangular aspect of the panicle, leaves, prickles and sepals is marked.

CONCLUSION

This review of the published names of the brambles which comprise the section *Triviales* in Watson's arrangement is no more than a revision of what is already known. Much remains unknown. A great deal of field work must be done and probably many more taxa described before a comprehensive account can be written. All that has been attempted here is to provide a firmer foundation for future work. The list in Dandy (1958) should be amended as follows:

Section *Triviales* P. J. Muell. *sec* Watson

<i>R. conjugens</i> (Bab.) J. B. L. Warren	<i>R. adenoleucus</i> Chaboiss.
<i>R. hebridensis</i> Edees	<i>R. halsteadensis</i> W. C. R. Wats.
<i>R. ooliticus</i> W. C. R. Wats.	<i>R. bagnallianus</i> Edees
<i>R. eboracensis</i> W. C. R. Wats.	<i>R. tuberculatus</i> Bab.
<i>R. sublustris</i> Lees	<i>R. babingtonianus</i> W. C. R. Wats.
<i>R. latifolius</i> Bab.	<i>R. rubriflorus</i> Purchas
<i>R. bucknallii</i> J. W. White	<i>R. britannicus</i> Rogers
<i>R. umbelliformis</i> Muell. & Lefèv.	<i>R. tenuiarmatus</i> Lees
<i>R. balfourianus</i> Bloxam ex Bab.	<i>R. triangularis</i> (A. Ley) Edees
<i>R. warrenii</i> Sudre	

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very grateful for help in the preparation of this paper to J. E. Dandy, A. Newton, R. J. Pankhurst, P. D. Sell and Prof. H. E. Weber, to the secretary of the Linnean Society for showing me the *Rubus* specimens in LINN, and to the curators of the other herbaria mentioned in this paper for much courtesy and for the loan of specimens. I should also like to acknowledge the work of the late B. A. Miles, who designated and labelled the lectotypes of *R. conjugens*, *R. ooliticus*, *R. balfourianus*, *R. tuberculatus*, *R. babingtonianus* and *R. britannicus*, but did not publish them.

REFERENCES

- BABINGTON, A. M. (1897). *Memorials, journal and botanical correspondence of Charles Cardale Babington*. Cambridge.
- BABINGTON, C. C. (1869). *The British Rubi*. London.
- BABINGTON, C. C. (1886). Notes on British Rubi. *J. Bot., Lond.*, **24**: 216–223, 225–237.
- BARTON, W. C. & RIDDELSDELL, H. J. (1932). Some *Rubus* problems in the light of Genevier's herbarium. *Proc. Cotteswold Nat. Fld Club*, **24**: 197–221.
- BEEK, A. VAN DE (1974). *Die Brombeeren des Geldrischen Distriktes innerhalb der Flora der Niederlande*. Tilburg.
- DANDY, J. E. (1958). *List of British vascular plants*. London.
- FOCKE, W. O. (1871). Nachträge zur Brombeerflora der Umgegend von Bremen. *Abh. naturw. Ver. Bremen*, **2**: 457–468.
- HAYNE, F. G. (1813). *Getreue Darstellung und Beschreibung der in der Arzneykunde gebräuchlichen Gewächse*, p. 3. Berlin.
- LEES, E. (1852). *Botany of the Malvern Hills*, 2nd ed. London.
- LEIGHTON, W. A. (1841). *A Flora of Shropshire*. London & Shrewsbury.
- LEIGHTON, W. A. (1848). Notes on Shropshire Rubi. *Phytologist*, **3**: 71–76, 159–166, 173–178.
- LINTON, W. R. (1891). In LINTON, E. F., ed. Report of the distributor for 1890. *Rep. botl Soc. Exch. Club Br. Isl.*, **1**: 281–321.
- RIDDELSDELL, H. J. (1920). British Rubi, 1900–1920. *J. Bot., Lond.*, **58**: 101–104.
- RIDDELSDELL, H. J. (1948). *Rubus L.*, in RIDDELSDELL, H. J. *et alii*, eds. *Flora of Gloucestershire*, pp. 142–179. Cheltenham.
- ROGERS, W. M. (1900). *Handbook of British Rubi*. London.
- SMITH, J. E. (1824). *The English Flora*, **2**. London.
- SUDRE, H. (1902). Les *Rubus* de l'herbier Boreau. *Bull. Soc. Étud. scient. Angers*, **31**: 51–155.
- SUDRE, H. (1904). Observations sur 'Set of British Rubi'. *Bull. Soc. Étud. scient. Angers*, **33**: 106–145.
- SUDRE, H. (1913). *Rubi Europae*, (6). Paris.
- WARREN, J. B. L. (1869). In TRIMEN, H. & DYER, W. T. T. *Flora of Middlesex*. London.
- WARREN, J. B. L. (1870). On the *dumetorum* group of *Rubi* in Britain. *J. Bot., Lond.*, **8**: 149–154, 169–176.
- WATSON, W. C. R. (1928). Minute stellate hairs on the upper face of bramble leaves. *J. Bot., Lond.*, **66**: 169–170.
- WATSON, W. C. R. (1935). Brambles of Kent and Surrey, 6. *Lond. Nat.*, **14**: 59–66.
- WATSON, W. C. R. (1946). *Rubus* appendix to Check-list of British vascular plants. *J. Ecol.*, **33**: 337–344.
- WATSON, W. C. R. (1948). *Rubus* appendix, in RIDDELSDELL, H. J. *et alii*, eds. *Flora of Gloucestershire*, pp. 614–623. Cheltenham.
- WATSON, W. C. R. (1950). *Rubus corylifolius* var. *purpureus* Bab. *Watsonia*, **1**: 289–290.
- WATSON, W. C. R. (1958). *Handbook of the Rubi of Great Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge.
- WEBER, H. E. (1972). *Die Gattung Rubus L. (Rosaceae) im nordwestlichen Europa*. Lehre.
- WEIHE, K. E. A. & NEES VON ESENBECK, C. G. D. (1822–1827). *Rubi Germanici*. Elberfeld.
- WHITE, J. W. (1901). Report of the distributor for 1900. *Rep. botl Soc. Exch. Club Br. Isl.*, **1**: 617–652.

(Accepted January 1975)