Notes

THE INTERSPECIFIC HYBRIDS OF THE RHIZOMATOUS COUCHES, *ELYTRIGIA* DESV. (POACEAE)

Until about 1980 the rhizomatous couches were usually placed in the genus *Agropyron* Gaertn. There are traditionally three species recognised in Britain:

A. repens (L.) P. Beauv.;
A. pycnanthum (Godr.) Godr. (*A. pungens* auct., non (Pers.) Roem. & Schult.);
A. junceum (L.) P. Beauv. (of which the British representative is ssp. *boreoatlanticum* Simonet & Guin., sometimes recognised as a separate species, *A. junceiforme* (Á. & D. Löve) Á. & D. Löve).

Following Melderis (1978) and Melderis & McClintock (1983) all these taxa were segregated into the genus *Elymus* L. and the necessary new combinations were made:

E. repens (L.) Gould;
E. pycnanthus (Godr.) Melderis (*E. pungens* auct., non (Pers.) Melderis) (later corrected to *E. athericus* (Link) Kerguélen by Kerguélen (1983));
E. farctus (Viv.) Runemark ex Melderis ssp. *boreoatlanticus* (Simonet & Guin.) Melderis.

Plant breeders and other students of wheat and other Triticeae (e.g. Löve 1984) have for long further subdivided *Elymus*, particularly into the non-rhizomatous species (e.g. *E. caninus* (L.) L.) and the rhizomatous species (e.g. the above three). This view is now the most usually accepted one, and for this reason it was adopted by Stace (1991) and Kent (1992). The rhizomatous species were separated into the genus *Elytrigia* Desv.:

E. repens (L.) Desv. ex Nevski;
E. atherica (Link) Kerguélen;
E. juncea (L.) Nevski ssp. *boreoatlantica* (Simonet & Guin.) Hyl.

Kerguélen (1987) actually cited the second species as *E. atherica* (Link) Kerguélen ex Carreras Mart. The publication by Carreras Martínez (1986) quoted by Kerguélen was a thesis at the University of Murcia, Spain. I have not seen a copy of this, and I have not traced one in this country (not in **BM** or **K**), but I have been kindly informed by Valéry Malecot of Paris (who has also not seen a copy) that his enquiries in Spain have shown that the thesis was not properly published and was not available for sale or on request, so cannot have been a vehicle for the valid publication of new names. It is quite likely that Kerguélen (deceased 1999) realised this, because in his standard French checklist (Kerguélen 1993) he dropped the "ex Carreras Mart." part of the author citation. Since Kerguélen (1987) quoted the full place of publication of the basionym, the combination *E. atherica* (Link) Kerguélen can be dated from his 1987 publication. The same applies to one other species (*E. campestris* (Godr. & Gren.) Kerguélen) and one subspecies (*E. elongata* ssp. *scirpea* (C. Presl) Kerguélen), which Kerguélen (1987) had similarly ascribed to Carreras Martínez. Kerguélen's checklist is now available on-line at www.dijon.inra.fr/malherbo/fdf/accueil1.htm, providing a valuable resource (containing over 74000 names) which is being maintained by Valéry Malecot. Strangely, although this was not made available until 1998 (fide Malecot), it reinstates the Carreras Martínez ascriptions (possibly Kerguélen neglected to update the electronic version of his work).

THE HYBRIDS

Hybrids between the three British species also occur in all three possible combinations. The nomenclatural situation regarding these is best discussed separately.

Elytrigia juncea × *E. repens*
The epithet usually used for this hybrid is *laxa*, originally as *Triticum laxum* Fr., and the correct combinations under the three genera are given below in the list of citations. Under *Elytrigia* Kerguélen (1987) correctly gave the citation *E.* × *laxa* (Fr.) Kerguélen. There appear to be no

nothosubspecific names to differentiate the hybrids involving the two subspecies of *E. juncea*. The epithet *laxa* (type from Sweden) actually applies to our (the North Atlantic) subspecies *boreoatlantica*, so a new nothosubspecific epithet would be needed for the hybrid involving the Mediterranean subspecies *juncea*.

There is also another (later) epithet used for this species in the earlier British literature. Druce (1907, p. 252) coined the name *Agropyron* × *hackelii* Druce; in that publication there is no diagnosis, but the name was validated in Druce (1929b, p. 877) by reference to an even earlier note (Druce 1905, p. 139–140), based on specimens labelled "*A. junceum* × *repens*" from Port Talbot Docks, Glamorgan, collected by H. J. Riddelsdell in July 1904, and from Arbroath, Angus, collected by W. A. Shoolbred in the same month. I choose the former as lectotype, represented by a specimen in **OXF**, with the entry from the Report of the Distributor pasted on the sheet. Riddelsdell commented: "I took the plant for this hybrid at first sight, and Mr Druce kindly removed any doubts I had." There follows a note to say that Hackel confirmed the determination. I fully agree with this, despite the fact that in 1967 A. Melderis annotated the sheet "*Agropyron pungens* × *repens*". The lower spikelets are very remote and the leaves have many prickle-hairs on the ribs on their upper surface, clearly showing the *A. junceum* influence. Despite the fact that Melderis had identified this specimen (wrongly) as *A. pungens* × *A. repens*, Melderis & McClintock (1983) listed *A.* × *hackelii* (wrongly) as a synonym of *Elymus* × *obtusiusculus*. However, there is, strangely, another specimen in **OXF** collected from Port Talbot, Glamorgan, again in July 1904, in this case by Druce. It is labelled on one of Druce's own "Herbarium Britannicum" labels: "*Agropyron hackelii* Druce Port Talbot Glamorgan July 1904 G. C. Druce". There is, however, not the slightest sign of any *Elytrigia juncea* characters in the specimen: the spike bears closely overlapping spikelets and the leaves have almost smooth ribs on their upper surface. The specimen was labelled "*Agropyron pungens* × *repens*" by A. Melderis in 1967, and I fully agree: the anthers are indehiscent and there are a few small marginal cilia on the leaf-sheath margins. Both hybrids were collected at Port Talbot in the same month, but the fact that the only reference cited by Druce (1929b) that contained a diagnosis was the one relating to the Riddelsdell plant fixes the name *hackelii* to the latter specimen, and places *A.* × *hackelii* within the synonymy of *E.* × *laxa*. There are two other Druce specimens in **OXF** labelled *A.* × *hackelii*. One, from Sker, Glamorgan (July 1904) is labelled *A. pungens* × *A. repens* by A. Melderis, and I agree with that. The other, from Yarmouth, E. Norfolk (July 1904) is labelled *A. pungens* by A. Melderis; it has dehisced anthers and again I agree with Melderis.

Elytrigia atherica × *E. juncea*

The relevant epithet is *acuta*, originally as *Triticum acutum* DC., and again the three correct combinations are listed below. The type of *Triticum acutum* is from the French Mediterranean. Kerguélen (1987) cited this taxon as *E.* × *acuta* (DC.) Kerguélen ex Carreras Mart, but this is incorrect on two counts: the attribution to Carreras Mart. is erroneous as noted above; and the combination *E.* × *acuta* had been made earlier by Tzvelev. In this case the nothosubspecies involving *E. juncea* ssp. *boreoatlantica* has the epithet *obtusiuscula*, originally as *Agropyron obtusiusculum* Lange, and as a subspecies under *Elytrigia* × *acuta* as nothossp. *obtusiuscula* (Lange) Kerguélen.

Elytrigia atherica × *E. repens*

There has been extraordinary confusion regarding the name of this hybrid. The epithet used almost universally over the past 25 years for this combination is *oliveri*, originally as *Agropyron oliveri* Druce (Kerguélen 1975; Melderis 1975, 1980; Melderis & McClintock 1983; Stace 1991; Kent 1992). However, in his original diagnosis of "X *Agropyron oliverii*", Druce (1912, p. 38) gave the parentage of the plant (from Blakeney, E. Norfolk, August 1911) as *A. pungens* var. *littorale* × *A. junceum*, and the diagnosis reiterated that parentage: "It differs from *pungens* by the more simple [presumably meaning less congested] inflorescence and from *junceum* by the smaller spikelets and less brittle stem". But soon after this (Druce 1914, p. 514) he was using the name *A.* × *oliveri* for the hybrid *A. pungens* × *A. repens*, and he remained of this opinion right up to the second edition of his *British Plant List* (Druce 1919, p. 410; 1927, p. 143; 1928, p. 134; 1929a, p. 768; 1929b, p. 877) and presumably until his death in 1932. Kerguélen (1987), despite his earlier (Kerguélen 1975) view on the parentage of *A.* × *oliveri*, stated "Melderis & McClintock (1983) rangent les épithètes '*laxa*' et '*oliveri*' dans des taxons séparés, mais en leur donnant la même formule hybride

'*Elymus pycnanthus* × *E. repens*'". This is not true! Melderis & McClintock clearly cited *Elymus* × *laxus* as *E. farctus* × *E. repens* and *Elymus* × *oliveri* as *E. pycnanthus* × *E. repens*. Kerguélen nevertheless cited *Elytrigia* × *oliveri* as a synonym of *E.* × *laxa*, under the parentage *E. atherica* × *E. repens*. Hence Kerguélen presented a novel but erroneous interpretation of the parentage of *E.* × *laxa*, while retaining Druce's later interpretation of *E.* × *oliveri*. Kerguélen (1987) cited Druce's plant as *Elytrigia* × *oliveri* (Druce) Kerguélen ex Carreras Mart. In this case it is not possible to correct the authority simply by dropping the "ex Carreras Mart." part because Kerguélen cited the name in synonymy and therefore it is invalid. It was most unusual for Kerguélen to make such an error, and he corrected it in the electronic version of his *Index Synonymique*, where *laxa* is given as the epithet for *E. juncea* × *E. repens*, and *oliveri* for *E. atherica* × *E. repens*. (The printed version of his work (1993) did not cover these hybrids).

The true parentage of *A.* × *oliveri* can of course be cleared up only by examination of the type specimen, and in Druce's herbarium at **OXF** is a specimen which I deduce to be this. It is labelled "*Agropyron pungens* × *repens* Blakeney Norfolk Aug. 1911 G.C. Druce Phyt.-Geog. Excurs." on one of Druce's own "Herbarium Britannicum" labels. Also on the sheet is an undated label in the handwriting of the eminent grass expert W. Hackel, to whom Druce sent much material for naming: "*Agropyron repens* × *junceum* [signed] Hackel". Thirdly, the sheet has attached an entry cut from a Report of the Botanical Exchange Club and Society of the British Isles (the date and exact origin of which I have been unable to trace, despite repeated searching through the printed Reports, and which in any case might not be relevant to this specimen), reading: "X *Agropyron Hackelii* Druce (= *A. junceum* × *repens*). This hybrid grass was found near Blakeney 28 in small quantity, at Southport 59, but these much nearer *A. junceum*, and at North Bull, Co. Dublin. At Blakeney a possible hybrid *A. pungens* × *repens* also occurred." Taken together, these three labels tell a confusing story. It seems that Druce collected his material from Blakeney in August 1911, named it as *A. pungens* × *A. repens*, and so labelled it on his sheet. He also sent some (or the same) material to Hackel, who named it *A. repens* × *A. junceum*, But why did Druce (1912) attribute a third parentage (*A. pungens* × *A. junceum*) to his plant? He was clearly hedging his bets in the undated Botanical Exchange Club Report quoted above, claiming that although the main material at Blakeney was *A. junceum* × *A. repens* there was some *A. pungens* × *A. repens* present as well, but there is no mention on that label of the original published parentage. Subsequently (1914 onwards) he used *oliveri* exclusively for *A. pungens* × *A. repens*. There seem to be no sheets at **OXF** with the epithet '*oliveri*' on the original label.

The type specimen of *A.* × *oliveri* is very clearly a hybrid of *Elytrigia juncea*. There can be little doubt that, as Hackel stated, it is *E. juncea* × *E. repens*, and therefore a synonym of *E.* × *laxa*, as was listed by Kerguélen (1987) albeit for the wrong parentage! Since it is merely a synonym I have not bothered to validate the combination under *Elytrigia* here. As there seems to be no name available for the hybrid *E. atherica* (*pungens*) × *E. repens* I have decided to name it *E.* × *drucei*, based on Druce's Port Talbot specimen, which he wrongly labelled *Agropyron hackelii*.

POSSIBLE FUTURE COMPLICATIONS

A further taxon in this group is *Elytrigia repens* ssp. *arenosa* (Spenn.) Á. Löve, which was carefully described by Trist (1995). Recently Scholz (1998) has pointed out that the epithet *arenosa* does not apply to the Atlantic coastal plant, but to a Continental plant earlier typified by Scholz (1993) on a specimen from Mainz, Germany. The epithet applicable to our coastal plant is *maritima* Tzvelev. Moreover Scholz claimed that this taxon belongs better in *E. campestris* than in *E. repens*, based mainly on the prominent, close veins on the leaf adaxial surface, and he made the new combination *E. campestris* ssp. *maritima* (Tzvelev) H. Scholz. This effectively adds a new British native species. Should it be found to form hybrids with the other three British species, new hybrid names will be needed.

A further complication might loom. Many Triticeae specialists, e.g. Löve (1984), further split from *Elytrigia* the genus *Thinopyrum* Á. Löve for the species with a disarticulating rhachis, e.g. *E. juncea*. as *T. junceum* (L.) Á. Löve. The evidence for doing this is not unequivocal, but, should it become desirable, new combinations for the two hybrids concerned under a new nothogeneric name for *Elytrigia* × *Thinopyrum* will be required.

THE CORRECT HYBRID NAMES

Elytrigia × laxa (Fr.) Kerguélen, *Lejeunia*, n.s., **120**: 88 (1987)
Basionym: *Triticum* × *laxum* Fr., *Novit. Fl. Suec. Mant.* **3:** 13 (1842)
Agropyron × *laxum* (Fr.) Tutin in A.R. Clapham, Tutin & E.F. Warb., *Fl. Brit. Isl.* 1463 (1952)
Elymus × *laxus* (Fr.) Melderis & D.C. McClint., *Watsonia* **14:** 394 (1983)
Agropyron × *oliveri* Druce, *Bot. Exch. Club Soc. Brit. Isles* **3:** 38 (1912)
Elymus × *oliveri* (Druce) Melderis & D.C. McClint., *Watsonia* **14:** 393 (1983)
Elytrigia × *oliveri* (Druce) Kerguélen, nom. inval., *Lejeunia*, n.s., **120**: 88 (1987)
Agropyron × *hackelii* Druce, *Bot. Soc. Exch. Club Brit. Isles* **8:** 877 (1929)
(*E. juncea* × *E. repens*)

Elytrigia × drucei Stace, **hybr. nov.**
Hybrida inter *Elytrigiam repentem* et *E. athericam*; ab *E. repenti* foliorum costis adaxialibus approximatioribus et prominentioribus differt; ab *E. atherica* foliorum vaginis ciliis marginalibus brevioribus et sparsioribus differt; antheris indehiscentibus, polline pro parte majore sterili.
Holotypus: Port Talbot, Glamorgan, v.c. 41, July 1904, G.C. Druce 28945 (**OXF**).
(*E. atherica* × *E. repens*)

Elytrigia × acuta (DC.) Tzvelev, *Novosti Sist. Vyssh. Rast.* **10**: 32 (1973)
Basionym: *Triticum* × *acutum* DC., *Cat. Pl. Horti Monsp.* 153 (1813)
Agropyron × *acutum* (DC.) Roem. & Schult., *Syst. Veg.* **2**: 751 (1817)
(*E. atherica* × *E. juncea*)

nothosubsp. obtusiuscula (Lange) Kerguélen, *Lejeunia*, n.s., **120**: 86 (1987)
Basionym: *Agropyron* × *obtusiusculum* Lange, *Haandb. Danske Fl., ed. 2*, 48 (1857)
Elytrigia × *obtusiuscula* (Lange) Hyl., *Nördkärlvaxt. Fl.* 1: 369 (1953)
Elymus × *obtusiusculus* (Lange) Melderis & D.C. McClint., *Watsonia* **14:** 394 (1982)
(*E. atherica* × *E. juncea* subsp. *boreoatlantica*)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Dick Brummitt (**K**) for helping to clarify a point in the ICBN, to Valéry Malecot (**P**) for investigating the thesis from Murcia and for alerting me to the web site for the *Index Synonymique*, and to Stephen Harris (**OXF**) for arranging the loan of the Druce material.

REFERENCES

CARRERAS MARTÍNEZ, M. A. (1986). *Estudio nomenclatural y corologico de las Gramineas del sureste de España*. Unpublished thesis, University of Murcia.
DRUCE, G. C. (1905). Report of the Distributor for 1904. *Botanical Exchange Club and Society of the British Isles* **2**: 108–140.
DRUCE, G. C. (1907). Report of the Distributor for 1906. *Botanical Exchange Club and Society of the British Isles* **2**: 206–252.
DRUCE, G. C. (1912). Plant Notes for 1911, etc. *Botanical Exchange Club and Society of the British Isles* **3**: 7–46.
DRUCE, G. C. (1914). Report of the distributor for 1913. *Botanical Exchange Club and Society of the British Isles* **3**: 441–516.
DRUCE, G. C. (1919). New county and other records [for 1918]. *Botanical Society and Exchange Club of the British Isles* **5**: 365–412.
DRUCE, G. C. (1927). New county and other records, 1926. *Botanical Society and Exchange Club of the British Isles* **8**: 102–144.
DRUCE, G. C. (1928). *British Plant List*, 2nd ed. T. Buncle & Co., Arbroath.
DRUCE, G. C. (1929a). New county and other records, 1928. *Botanical Society and Exchange Club of the British Isles* **8**: 722–769.
DRUCE, G. C. (1929b). Notes on the second edition of the "British Plant List". *Botanical Society and Exchange Club of the British Isles* **8**: 867–877.
KENT, D. H. (1992). *List of Vascular Plants of the British Isles*. Botanical Society of the British Isles, London.

KERGUÉLEN, M. (1975). Les Gramineae (Poaceae) de la flore française. Essai de mise au point taxonomique et nomenclaturale. *Lejeunia, n. s.* 75.
KERGUÉLEN, M. (1983). Les Graminées de France au travers de "Flora Europaea" et de la "Flore" du C.N.R.S. *Lejeunia, n. s.* 110.
KERGUÉLEN, M. (1987). Données taxonomiques, nomenclaturales et chorologiques pour une révision de la flore de France. *Lejeunia n. s.* 120.
KERGUÉLEN, M. (1993). *Index synonymique de la flore de France.* Muséum Nationale d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.
LÖVE, Á. (1984). Conspectus of the *Triticeae*. *Feddes Repertorium* **95**: 425–521.
MELDERIS, A. (1975). *Agropyron* Gaertn., in STACE, C. A., ed. *Hybridization and the flora of the British Isles*, pp. 568–570. Academic Press, London.
MELDERIS, A. (1978). Taxonomic notes on the tribe Triticeae (Gramineae), with special reference to the genera *Elymus* L. *sensu lato*, and *Agropyron* Gaertner *sensu lato*. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **76**: 369–384.
MELDERIS, A. (1980). *Elymus* L., in TUTIN, T. G. *et al.*, eds. *Flora Europaea* **5**: 192–198. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
MELDERIS, A. & MCCLINTOCK, D. (1983). The genera *Elymus* L. and *Leymus* Hochst. in Britain. *Watsonia* **14**: 391–395.
SCHOLZ, H. (1993). *Elytrigia arenosa* (Gramineae) - ein mitteleuropäischer Relikt-Endemit. *Botanische Jahrbücher für Systematik, Pflanzengeschichte und Pflanzengeographie* **115**: 351–366.
SCHOLZ, H. (1998). Taxonomy and nomenclature of "*Elytrigia maritima*" Tzvelev. *Bulletin. Société pour l'échange des plantes vasculaires de l'Europe et du bassin Méditerranéen* **27**: 102–104.
STACE, C. A. (1991). *New flora of the British Isles*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
TRIST, P. J. O. (1995). *Elytrigia repens* (L.) Desv. ex Nevski subsp. *arenosa* (Spenner) Á. Löve (Poaceae) in north-western Europe. *Watsonia* **20**: 385–390.

C. A. STACE
Department of Biology, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH

SALIX CAPREA L. × *S. MYRSINIFOLIA* SALISB. × *S. PHYLICIFOLIA* L. IN PERTHSHIRE

During a programme involving field surveys and a general reassessment of Scottish montane willow hybrids, a number of apparently new hybrid combinations have been discovered. One of these which was collected on 7 August 1997 by the author near Milton Roro, Glen Lyon in mid-Perths., v.c. 88, was suspected to be the triple hybrid, *Salix caprea* L. × *S. myrsinifolia* Salisb. × *S. phylicifolia* L., due to its appearance and also because both *S. caprea* and *S. myrsinifolia* × *S. phylicifolia* (*S.* × *tetrapla* Walker) were growing nearby. Further specimens were collected in July 2000 and sent to R. D. Meikle who confirmed the tentative determination. There appeared to be no previous confirmed records for this hybrid in Britain according to Meikle (1975), although E. F. Linton (1913) had earlier suggested that specimens collected by him near Clova, v.c. 90 (E.F.L. reference numbers 36 and 78) might possibly be referred to this cross. The hybrid is not shown in the British list (Kent 1992, 1997; Kent & Stace 2000). However, subsequent information has been provided by R.D.M. which shows that he determined the same cross very recently from specimens collected late in 2000 in Yorkshire, v.c. 64, by M. Wilcox (R.D.M. and M. Wilcox, pers. comm.).

As there were no certain records for this hybrid combination prior to these confirmations and the fact that triple hybrids are always extremely difficult to determine, the alternative possibilities were considered, by comparing the published descriptions in Linton (1913), and those of Meikle (1975) with the specimens collected by the author in Perthshire, reference number *DJT CR9/00*, although the latter lacked catkins, so a full comparison was not possible. There is very little doubt that *S. phylicifolia* is one parent of the hybrid *DJT CR9/00,* therefore likely alternatives seemed to be *S. cinerea* L. × *S. phylicifolia* (*S.* × *laurina* Sm.), or *S. caprea* × *S. phylicifolia.* Although Linton (1913) suggested that some material determined as *S.* × *laurina* might possibly refer to the triple hybrid *S. cinerea* × *S. myrsinifolia* × *S. phylicifolia* (which is not only possible but very probable, as *S. phylicifolia* may not occur in the pure state in Breadalbane) most if not all of its records have been redetermined as *S.* × *tetrapla* Walker (R.D.M., pers. comm.), although it is possible that *S.* × *laurina* could have been introduced in some areas. Similarly, it is also suggested that at least some of the records, and accordingly the descriptions, of *S. caprea* × *S. phylicifolia* might refer to the

triple hybrid *S. caprea* × *S. myrsinifolia* × *S. phylicifolia*, the same cross determined by R.D.M. for the Perthshire hybrid, *DJT CR9/00*. However, Linton (1913) suggested that *S. caprea* × *S. phylicifolia* was extremely rare in Britain and had been much confused with the widely distributed *S.* × *laurina*, so it cannot be assumed that the old records for the former refer to the triple cross determined for the Perthshire hybrid *DJT CR 9/00*. Although a comparison of the descriptions in Linton (1913) and by Meikle (1975) for hybrids involving *S. phylicifolia* which are recorded in Perthshire shows that the descriptions which fit the hybrid *DJT CR 9/00* best are those which were published as *S. caprea* × *S. phylicifolia*, and therefore suggest that these do not refer to *S.* × *laurina* or to the similar triple cross *S. cinerea* × *S. myrsinifolia* × *S. phylicifolia*, but for the reasons given above most probably refer to *S. caprea* × *S. myrsinifolia* × *S. phylicifolia*, and therefore provide additional evidence that the hybrid *DJT CR 9/00* has been correctly determined as the latter.

A description of the main characters of the hybrid *DJT CR 9/00* is as follows:

A bush approximately 2·5 m high. Mature twigs dark reddish-brown, glossy and becoming glabrous; shoots moderately pubescent. Leaves coriaceous, dark, bright green and glossy on the upper surface, and rather thinly pubescent with the hairs in the majority confined to the midrib and near to the apex, or subglabrous, the lower surface pale green, glaucous and glabrous with prominent nervation, the majority with the lamina obovate or broadly obovate to subrotund, the largest typically 5 cm long, 3·5 cm wide, shortly mucronate to cuspidate at apex, the margins narrowly recurved, shallowly serrate to remotely serrulate, the smaller leaves narrowly rounded, the larger broadly rounded at base; petioles moderately pubescent. Foliage not turning black when dried.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the published evidence the description of the Perthshire hybrid *DJT CR 9/00* best fits the descriptions given for *S. caprea* × *S. phylicifolia*, other than a slight variance in the leaf indumentum, which may not be significant. However, the records of *S. phylicifolia* in the area in question have been shown to refer to *S. myrsinifolia* × *S. phylicifolia*, so the descriptions of *S. caprea* × *S. phylicifolia* very probably refer to the triple hybrid *S. caprea* × *S. myrsinifolia* × *S. phylicifolia*, and provide additional support for the determination of the Perthshire hybrid *DJT CR 9/00* as this cross and to confirm its presence in Britain. The recent record from Yorkshire gives further confidence in its existence. It is, however, possible that this hybrid has been overlooked in the past. In the absence of *S. phylicifolia*, at least some of the older records for *S. caprea* × *S. phylicifolia* might have more correctly referred to the same triple cross. Ideally, it would have been advisable to locate the herbarium material which represents the old records on which the descriptions were based in order to confirm the status of the Perthshire record, however, in the absence of a prolonged and perhaps unsuccessful search it is necessary to rely on the present specimens and the original descriptions, and assume that they refer to the hybrid combinations as stated. The Perthshire hybrid has now been propagated from cuttings so further information may be obtained if catkins are eventually produced.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I should like to thank Desmond Meikle for his confirmation of identity and other helpful comments, David Mardon for local field information, Mr. M. Wilcox for additional details of the Yorkshire record, and finally, the Science and Research Committee of the B.S.B.I. for their support and a grant towards the costs of part of this project.

REFERENCES

KENT, D. H. (1992). *List of vascular plants of the British Isles.* Botanical Society of the British Isles, London.

KENT, D. H. (1997). *List of vascular plants of the British Isles,* Suppl. 1. Botanical Society of the British Isles, London.

KENT, D. H. & STACE, C. A. (2000). *List of vascular plants of the British Isles,* Suppl. 2. Botanical Society of the British Isles, London.

LINTON, E. F. (1913). *A monograph of the British Willows. Journal of Botany,* London 51 (Suppl.): 1–92.

MEIKLE, R. D. (1975). *Salix* L., in STACE, C. A., ed. *Hybridization and the flora of the British Isles*, pp. 304–338. Academic Press, London.

D. J. TENNANT
Low Missise Farm, Laverton, Ripon, North Yorkshire, HG4 3SY

A NEW SPECIES OF *RUBUS* SECT. MICANTES (ROSACEAE) FORMERLY KNOWN AS A VARIANT OF *R. CRINIGER* (E. F. LINTON) ROGERS

A bramble which is locally abundant in the Colchester area of Essex (v.c. 19) and along the Stour valley on the Suffolk side (v.c.c. 25 and 26) and is scattered in North West Suffolk (v.c. 26), West Norfolk (v.c. 28) and South Essex (v.c. 18) with one known station in East Kent (v.c. 15) has been dismissed as "var. *trifolius*" of *Rubus criniger* in recent years. Previously to this, E. S. Edees had considered it to be a form of *Rubus conspersus* W. C. R. Watson, though Watson himself had appended the name *Rubus egregius* var. *effeminatus* Focke, to a sheet sent him in 1923 through the Botanical Exchange Club by G. C. Brown, and collected from Stanway near Colchester. This sheet is now in **BM**. (D. E. Allen, pers. comm.)

The present author has had ample opportunity to study the plant, with annual visits to Essex for nearly twenty years, as well as its stations in the other counties mentioned, and has long held the view that it is distinctly and constantly different from its supposed parent. During the summer of 2000, the plant was collected as widely as possible in Essex, West Suffolk and West Norfolk and comparisons made with *R. criniger*, also from as many sites as possible, including some from Herts. v.c. 20 and Cambs. v.c. 29, where the present plant has not been recorded, and it was discovered that the differences between the two plants, even when they are growing in close proximity, as they do at Waterhouse Plantation, Tottington, v.c. 28, were even greater than was at first thought. Neither have any plants been found which could be regarded as intermediate between the two. It would be true to say that the only similarities between the two are the overall greyish green coloration, the hairiness of the primocanes and the structure and dimensions of the stem prickles. It is therefore proposed to name the plant with three leaflets as:

Rubus trinovantium A. L. Bull **sp. nov.**
A *R. crinigero* his notis differt. Turiones glandibus brevistipitatis numerosis vel copiosis, in partibus turionis ejusdem diversis quoad numerum variabilibus, vestiti. Aculei aliquot in turionum paginis sicut in angulis interdum reperiantur. Folia ternata vel rarissime quatuor vel quinque foliola ferentia; foliola terminalia elliptica vel obovatocuspidata, cuspide 1·5–2 cm longa praedita. Paniculae laxae, relative pauciflorae, parte superiore subracemosa brevi truncata; pedicelli 2–4 cm longi. Adsunt 2–4 rami inferiores ascendentes ad 15 cm longi. plerumque modo 3–7 floribus instructi. Flores magni, 3–3·5 cm diametro, stellati; petala elliptica, 1·5–1·75 cm longa, emarginata; antherae glabrae.

Rubus trinovantium differs from *R. criniger* in the following characters. The stems are clothed with numerous to abundant short-stalked glands, variable in number on different parts of the same stem. A few prickles may occasionally be found on the faces of the stems as well as on their angles. The leaves are ternate or very rarely bear four or five leaflets; the terminal leaflets are elliptic to obovate-cuspidate, with the cusp 1·5 to 2 cm long. The panicles are lax and relatively few-flowered, with a short truncate subracemose upper part; the pedicels are 2–4 cm long. There are 2–4 ascending lower branches up to 15 cm long and usually only 3–7 flowered. The flowers are large, 3–3·5 cm in diameter and starry the petals are elliptic, 1·5–1·75 cm long and notched, and the anthers are glabrous.

Rubus criniger belongs to the Series *Vestiti*, but bearing in mind that the armature of *R. trinovantium* is somewhat variable, to the extent that shade plants occasionally have consistently longer stalked glands reminiscent of the group *Radulae* as at Lexden Gathering Ground near Colchester, and some prickles may be found which are not on the angles of the stem. it is felt that the new species should be placed in the Series *Micantes*. It has been found in 16 hectads to date.

HOLOTYPE: Tiptree Heath, Essex. v.c. 19., TL883148 July 12th 2000. **BM**.
Isotypes are in Herb. A. Newton and Herb. A. L. Bull.

Representative Exsiccatae from High Woods, Colchester, TL9926, July 12th 2000; Lexden Gathering Ground, TL9725, July 12th 2000; Layer Breton Heath, TL9118 July 16th 1981; East Donyland, Colchester, TM02 July 23rd 1972, all in Essex; Denstead Wood, East Kent, TR05 July 19th 1990; Arger Fen, West Suffolk, TL9335 July 10th 2000; Assington Thicks, West Suffolk TL9337, July 10th 2000; Letch Moor, Icklingham, West Suffolk, TL7971, Aug. 20th 1971 and July 17th 2000; South Runcton, West Norfolk TF6407, July 23rd 1977 and Waterhouse Plantation, Tottington, West Norfolk, TL9094, July 15th 2000 are all in Herb. A. L. Bull.

R. trinovantium is a bramble of acid sands and gravels which characterise the formerly extensive heathland that stretched from Tiptree to both north and south of Colchester. The West Suffolk site at Arger Fen is on the edge of the former Leaven Heath, whilst nearby Assington Thicks is ancient woodland with some patches of acid soils. Letch Moor at Icklingham and Waterhouse Plantation, Tottington, are both areas of overgrown wet acid heathland and South Runcton lies on the Norfolk Greensand.

The name *trinovantium* derives from Trinovantes, the ancient British tribe whose territory centred on the Colchester area at the time of the Roman invasion.

My thanks are due to Mr Philip Oswald for writing the Latin description, to Dr D. E. Allen for tracing specimens in **BM** and to Mr A. Newton for advice on the name *trinovantium*.

A. L. BULL
"Hillcrest", East Tuddenham, Dereham, Norfolk, NR20 3JJ

DATES OF PUBLICATION OF COUNTY FLORAS

It seems to have been generally overlooked that, for various reasons, county Floras are liable to bear an erroneous date on the title page. This is a matter for concern not merely bibliographically, for in some of these publications new taxa have been described or valid new combinations perpetrated unwittingly. The increasing attention being given to establishing the history of rare species at individual sites also makes precision in published dates of records a matter of importance.

The usual reason for misdating would seem to have been the tendency for small printers, in the days before computerised typesetting, to treat such major and often typographically complex jobs as 'fillers'. to be worked on whenever business was slack and to be laid aside for extended periods when more urgent or more profitable commitments intervened. In a publication process so leisurely and protracted, including the dispatch of bound copies maybe some considerable time after the receipt of the final corrected proofs, it could easily happen that an obsolete scheduled date was left unamended. A particularly glaring instance where this is presumed to have been the cause is the first edition of F. Townsend's *Flora of Hampshire, including the Isle of Wight*. Though allegedly published in 1883, an addendum was inserted (just before the index) at a clearly very late stage and the dates of some of the records in that show that it cannot have appeared before 1884 - assuming that all the bound copies initially issued included it. There is also reason to suspect that the second edition of that work came out in 1905 instead of, as stated, 1904 (Allen 1986). Two more recent cases have been pointed out by Mitchell (2000). J. P. Brunker's *Flora of the county Wicklow*, though bearing the date '1950', actually appeared in the year following, as mentioned at the time by Praeger (1951) and since confirmed by the publisher's records. J. Harron's *Flora of Lough Neagh* was similarly published a year later that the indicated one. Printing delays are not invariably responsible for this phenomenon, though. The *Flora of the Isle of Man* (Allen 1986), though ready for issue by the date on the title page, was held back by the publisher for two years in order for its appearance to coincide with 'Manx Heritage Year'.

Publication can also be earlier than the year stated. T. Whilde's *The natural history of Connemara*, in which vascular plants are included in a list in the appendix, appeared in reality in 1993, not '1994' (Mitchell 2000). Copies of the section on the botany contributed by T. H. Cooper to the second volume (1835) of T. W. Horsfield's *The history, antiquities and topography of the county of Sussex* were distributed by Cooper as a separate pre-print a year before the publication of the book itself, as shown by one that has survived in the W. J. Hooker Letters in the archives of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, accompanied by a dated covering letter.

REFERENCES

ALLEN, D. E. (1986)('1984'). *Flora of the Isle of Man*. Manx Museum & National Trust, Douglas.
ALLEN, D. E. (1996). Some earlier workers on the Hampshire flora, in BREWIS, A., BOWMAN, P. & ROSE, F., eds., *The flora of Hampshire*. Harley Books, Colchester.
MITCHELL, M. E. (2000). The Irish floras: a checklist of non-serial publications. *Glasra* **4**: 47–57.
PRAEGER, R. L. (1951). Review of J. P. Brunker, *Flora of the county Wicklow*. *Irish Naturalist's Journal* **10**: 192–195.

D. E. ALLEN
Lesney Cottage, Middle Road, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 5EJ