

disadvantageous to nomenclatural stability in accordance with Art. 56, we propose this Linnaean name for rejection.

Acceptance of this proposal would neutralise the nomenclatural threats posed by the obscure, uncertain name *Plantago strictissima*, particularly regarding the name *P. serpentina*. Rejection of this proposal would mean that *P. strictissima* would become the correct name at species level for the entity broadly referred to as *P. serpentina*.

#### Author information

DI, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5491-7568>

RDP, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4983-8931>

GH, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4365-6934>

## (2979) Proposal to conserve the name *Ranunculus isthmicus* against *R. schowii* (*Ranunculaceae*)

Fabrizio Bartolucci,<sup>1</sup>  Gianniantonio Domina<sup>2</sup>  & Fabio Conti<sup>1</sup> 

1 *Centro Ricerche Floristiche dell'Appennino (Università di Camerino - Parco Nazionale del Gran Sasso e Monti della Laga), Via Prov. le km 4,2 - San Colombo, 67021 Barisciano (L'Aquila), Italy*

2 *Dipartimento di Scienze Agrarie, Alimentari e Forestali (SAAF), Università di Palermo, Viale delle Scienze, edificio 4, 90128 Palermo, Italy*

Address for correspondence: Fabrizio Bartolucci, [fabrizio.bartolucci@gmail.com](mailto:fabrizio.bartolucci@gmail.com)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.13012>

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

(2979) *Ranunculus isthmicus* Boiss., *Diagn. Pl. Orient.* 6: 4. Jul 1846 [Angiosp.: *Ranuncul.*], nom. cons. prop.

**Lectotypus (hic designatus):** [Greece], Corinthus, Apr 1842, *Boissier* (G barcode G00390573 [photo!]; isolectotypi: G barcode G00390574 [photo!], JE barcodes JE00021559 [photo!] & JE00021560 [photo!], K barcodes K000675357 [photo!], K000675358 [photo!] & K000675360 [photo!]).

(=) *Ranunculus schowii* Tineo in Gussone, *Fl. Sicul. Syn.* 2: 889. Jan–Sep 1845, nom. rej. prop.

**Lectotypus (hic designatus):** [Italy, Sicily], “*Ranunculus schowii* Tin., fra Vittoria e Terranova, *Schow*” (PAL No. 45282!).

*Ranunculus schowii* was described by Vincenzo Tineo in Gussone (*Fl. Sicul. Syn.* 2: 889. 1845) providing a detailed description, quoting a precise collection locality “In arvis arenosis: fra Vittoria e Terranova (*Tin.*)” and citing an unpublished illustration “*Tin. ined.*”. The name was typified by Bartolucci & al. (in *Plants* (Switzerland) 11: 3094. 2022) with the illustration (NAP barcode NAP0000512) cited in the protologue considering that no herbarium specimens referable to the original material had been found. Further research carried out in February 2023 in the Herbarium Mediterraneum Panormitanum (PAL), where Tineo’s main collection is housed, allowed us to trace one syntype (Art. 9.6 of the *ICN*, Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018) labelled “Majo | *Ranunculus schowii* Tin. | fra Vittoria e | Terranova Schow” (PAL No. 45282). The illustration NAP0000512 is based on this sample. The lectotype designation in Bartolucci & al. (l.c. 2022) was not in conformity with Art. 9.12 and must not be followed. So we designate above the herbarium specimen PAL No. 45282 as the lectotype. The study of this lectotype, not previously possible when solely the illustration was available, clearly shows that the name *R. schowii* applies to a taxon currently known as *R. isthmicus* Boiss. s.str., a South Mediterranean species distributed in North Africa, Sicily, Greece, and

Turkey (e.g., Cook in Tutin & al., *Fl. Eur.*, ed. 2, 1: 278. 1993; Strid in Strid & Tan, *Fl. Hellen.* 2: 51. 2002; Pignatti & al., *Fl. Ital.*, ed. 2, 1: 849. 2017; Bartolucci & al. in *Pl. Biosyst.* 152: 179–303. 2018).

*Ranunculus isthmicus* was described by Boissier (*Diagn. Pl. Orient.*, ser. 1, 6: 4. 1846), providing a detailed description and quoting a precise collection locality “Habitat in declivibus Isthmi Corinthiaci paulo supra *Calamathi* ad Corinthum eundo, legi floriferum fructiferumque ineunte Aprili 1842” based on specimens of “*R. orientalis* Boiss. pl. exs. e Grecia non L.”. This name, to the best of our knowledge, has not yet been typified. We were able to trace some herbarium specimens housed in G, JE, and K which can be considered original material (Art. 9.4). All the specimens are complete, well conserved, and agree with the protologue, only the labels are slightly different: “Isthmus Corinthiacus in arenosis, Apr 1842, *Boissier s.n.*” (K barcode K000675360); “Corinthus, Apr 1842, *Boissier s.n.*” (G barcodes G00390573 & G00390574, JE barcodes JE00021559 & JE00021560, K barcodes K000675357 & K000675358). Among the duplicate specimens cited above, we select a sample kept in G (barcode G00390573) as lectotype for the name *R. isthmicus*.

The name *Ranunculus schowii* Tin. is not cited by Hörandl & Raab-Straube (*Euro+Med PlantBase.* 2015–, <http://ww2.bgbm.org/EuroPlusMed/>, accessed 29 Mar 2023), and is considered by *Plants of the World Online* [POWO] (<https://powo.science.kew.org/taxon/urn:lsid:ipni.org:names:713783-1>, accessed 29 Mar 2023) and by *World Flora Online* [WFO] (<https://wfoplantlist.org/plant-list/>, accessed 29 Mar 2023) as a synonym of *R. monspeliacus* L. Some Italian authors regarded it as a dubious synonym of *R. gracilis* E.D. Clarke (Fiori, *Nuov. Fl. Italia* 1: 641–800. 1924; Giardina & al. in *Boccone* 20: 5–582. 2007). Only Bartolucci & al. (l.c. 2022) recently discussed the possible synonymy of *R. schowii* with *R. isthmicus*.

Considering the above data, the name *Ranunculus isthmicus* is actually a later synonym of *R. schowii*. However, it is a widely accepted name used by all the standard Euro-Mediterranean floras,

checklists and taxonomic database (e.g., Davis, Fl. Turkey 1: 185–186. 1965; Greuter & al., Med-Checkl. 4: 432. 1989; Cook in Tutin & al., l.c.; Strid in Strid & Tan, l.c.; Fennane & Ibn Tattou, Fl. Vasc. Maroc 1: 331. 2005; Pignatti & al., l.c.; Bartolucci & al., l.c. 2018; Hörandl & Raab-Straube, l.c.; African Plant Database, <https://africanplantdatabase.ch/en/nomen/specie/152131/ranunculus-isthmicus-boiss>, accessed 29 Mar 2023, POWO, l.c.; WFO, l.c.). In contrast, *R. schowii* is a long-misinterpreted name not adopted in the current literature. To demonstrate this further, a Google Scholar search on 29 March 2023 returned 139 articles for “*Ranunculus isthmicus*” and only 1 for “*Ranunculus schowii*”.

Hence, we propose to conserve the name *Ranunculus isthmicus* against *R. schowii* because we think that decision would best serve nomenclatural stability and allow continuation of the use of the well-established name *R. isthmicus*. Rejection of the present proposal would have undesirable consequences also considering the two new combinations “*Ranunculus schowii* subsp. *stepporum*”

and “*Ranunculus schowii* subsp. *tenuifolius*” that would be needed for *R. isthmicus* subsp. *stepporum* P.H. Davis (in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 23: 151. 1960) and *R. isthmicus* subsp. *tenuifolius* (Steven) P.H. Davis (l.c.: 152).

#### Author information

FB, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8199-6003>

GD, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4184-398X>

FC, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7391-6691>

#### Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge Directors and Curators of the consulted herbaria. This research was funded by “Progetto di Ricerca di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale” (PRIN) “PLAN.T.S 2.0—towards a renaissance of PLANT Taxonomy and Systematics” led by the University of Pisa, grant number 2017JW4HZK.

## (2980) Proposal to conserve the name *Rubus repens* (L.) Kuntze against *R. repens* Weston (*Rosaceae*)

I.M. Turner<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Singapore Botanical Liaison Officer, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, TW9 3AB, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup> Singapore Botanic Gardens, National Parks Board, 1 Cluny Road, Singapore 259569

Address for correspondence: I.M. Turner, [i.turner@kew.org](mailto:i.turner@kew.org)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12999>

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

(2980) *Rubus repens* (L.) Kuntze, Revis. Gen. Pl. 1: 223. 5 Nov 1891 (*Dalibarda repens* L., Sp. Pl.: 491. 1 Mai 1753) [Angiosp.: *Ros.*], nom. cons. prop.

Lectotypus (vide Reveal in Regnum Veg. 127: 41. 1993): *Kalm*, Herb. Linnaeus No. 653.24 (LINN).

(H) *Rubus repens* Weston, Bot. Univ. 1: 257. 11 Oct 1770, nom. rej. prop.

Typus: non designatus.

The false violet or dewdrop is a creeping herb of the forest floor native to north-eastern North America. Linnaeus described the species as *Dalibarda repens* L. (Sp. Pl.: 491. 1753). In the second edition of *Species plantarum*, Linnaeus considered *Dalibarda* to be a synonym of *Rubus*, renaming *D. repens* as *R. dalibarda* L. (Sp. Pl., ed. 2: 708. 1762). This name is illegitimate as the epithet ‘*repens*’ was then available for use in *Rubus*. Since Linnaeus’s time opinions have differed on whether or not to recognise *Dalibarda* as a separate genus. Recent molecular phylogenies support inclusion of *Dalibarda* within *Rubus* (Huang & al. in Taxon 72: 278–306. 2023). Those favouring this classification have referred to the false violet as *R. repens* (L.) Kuntze (Alice & al. in Fl. N. Amer. 9: 51. 2014). However, it transpires that this is an illegitimate later homonym as *R. repens* Weston (Bot. Univ. 1: 257. 1770) has priority over Kuntze’s combination.

*Rubus repens* Weston is entirely based on the description of a bramble from Sicily published by Cupani (Hort. Cathol., ed. 2:

193. 1696). No potential types have been traced among the extant herbarium material or published illustrations left by Cupani (Van de Beek in Adansonia, sér. 2, 38: 42. 2016), so the identity of the species remains unresolved. Gussone (Fl. Sicul. Syn. 1: 567. 1843) cited Cupani’s description under *R. acheruntinus* (Ten.) Ten. (Syll. Pl. Fl. Neapol.: 603. 1831) without explanation. *Rubus acheruntinus* is also an uncertain taxon, probably representing a hybrid between *R. caesius* L. and another local species (A. van de Beek, pers. comm.). What is more certain is that *R. repens* Weston is an obscure name, not listed in IPNI, that has been generally overlooked and never taken up by any author after Weston. “*Rubus repens*” also appears in Gueldenstaedt (Reis. Russland: 4, 197. 1791), but the designation is not validly published in the absence of a description or diagnosis, or reference to a previously published description or diagnosis.

The strict application of the rules of priority would require a new name in *Rubus* for *Dalibarda repens* L., as there appear to be no heterotypic synonyms at species rank available. The loss of *R. repens* (L.) Kuntze for purely nomenclatural reasons is best avoided as the conflicting homonym is scarcely known and has not been used in 250 years. This can be achieved by conserving Kuntze’s combination against Weston’s name, as proposed here.

#### Acknowledgements

Thanks go to Abraham van de Beek for advice concerning Weston’s name and its possible identity.