



<https://doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.595.2.11>

Erratum: Idrees, M. & Zhiyong, Z. (2022) Lectotypification of 16 names in *Rubus* subg. *Idaeobatus*, 12 names in *R.* subg. *Malachobatus*, and 1 name in *R.* subg. *Chamaebatus* (Rosaceae). *Phytotaxa* 559 (1): 13–24.

In our paper entitled “Lectotypification of 16 names in *Rubus* subg. *Idaeobatus*, 12 names in *R.* subg. *Malachobatus*, and 1 name in *R.* subg. *Chamaebatus* (Rosaceae) (*Phytotaxa* 559(1): 013–024), we erroneously cited the isolectotypes (P00755222 & P00755224) for *Rubus croceacanthus* Léveillé (1912: 33) on page 15, which we rectify here.

Rubus croceacanthus Léveillé (1912: 33)

Type (lectotype, designated here):—SOUTH KOREA. Corée: Quelpaert, dans les haies a Setchimeri, May 1911, *T. Taquet* 5554 (barcode E00010581!, isolectotypes: P00755222!, P00755224!). [Image available at <https://data.rbge.org.uk/herb/E00010581>].

Should read:

Rubus croceacanthus Léveillé (1912: 33)

Type (lectotype, designated here):—SOUTH KOREA. Corée: Quelpaert, dans les haies a Setchimeri, May 1911, *T. Taquet* 5554 (barcode E00010581!). [Image available at <https://data.rbge.org.uk/herb/E00010581>].

Thanks to Dr. Véronique Durand-Andro (Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle, Paris) for pointing out the error.

References

- Idrees, M. & Zhiyong, Z. (2022) Lectotypification of 16 names in *Rubus* subg. *Idaeobatus*, 12 names in *R.* subg. *Malachobatus*, and 1 name in *R.* subg. *Chamaebatus* (Rosaceae). *Phytotaxa* 559 (1): 13–24.
<https://doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.559.1.2>
- Léveillé, H. (1912) III. Decades plantarum novarum LXXXIX. *Repertorium Specierum Novarum Regni Vegetabilis* 11: 30–33. [<https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/page/237194#page/41/mode/1up>]