(Wurdack, l.c. 1976, in Brittonia 39: 159–164. 1987; Almeda, l.c. 1993; Mendoza & Fernández, l.c.) or synonymized under *Meriania* or *Wurdastom* B. Walln. (*Melastomataceae*: *Cyphostyleae*) (Mendoza & Fernández, l.c.; Mendoza in Acta Bot. Mex. 127: e1642. 2020). The five species currently recognized in *Centronia* are distributed in the Andes from Colombia to Peru, or the Guayana Shield in Venezuela, Colombia, and Brazil, with all of them having been rarely collected from very restricted populations (Don in Mem. Wern. Nat. Hist. Soc. 4: 314–315. 1822; Triana in Trans. Linn. Soc. London 28: 71–72. 1873; Macbride in Publ. Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Bot. Ser. 13: 326–328. 1941; Wurdack in Bot. Mus. Leafl. 18: 160–166. 1958, in Mem. New York Bot. Gard. 10: 135–186. 1964, l.c. 1973; Berry & al., Fl. Venez. Guayana 6: 263–528. 2001; Baumgratz & al., Catal. Pl. Fung. Brasil 2: 1236–1278. 2010; Almeda & al., Catal. Pl. Líquen. Colombia: 1585–1664. 2016). *Graffenrieda*, on the other hand, includes ca. 70 recognized species from 88 validly published species and infraspecies names, and it has a wider distribution (and often more numerous herbarium collections) from southern Mexico and the Antilles to Bolivia and Brazil (Almeda in Davidse & al., Fl. Mesoamer. 4: 164–337. 2009; Goldenberg & Meirelles in Syst. Bot. 36: 119–123. 2011; Michelangeli & Goldenberg in Brittonia 66: 170–173. 2013; Michelangeli & Ulloa in Phytotaxa 77: 43–48. 2013; Almeda & al. in Phytotaxa 163: 39–47. 2014; Lima & al. in Kew Bull. 72: 47. 2017; Murillo & al. in Phytotaxa 391: 131–137. 2019).

Centronia is distinguished from other genera in the *Merianieae* by the combination of large flowers, calyptrate calyx, and anthers with a dorsal connective appendage (Wurdack, l.c. 1973). The presence of a second dorsal connective appendage has also been associated with species of *Centronia* (Wurdack, l.c. 1973), but while this character is present in many of the species formerly treated in this genus, it is notoriously absent in the type and a few other species. *Graffenrieda* also has anthers with dorsal connective appendages and usually smaller flowers. While most species of *Graffenrieda* have a calyx opening by separate lobes, some species do have a calyptrate calyx, and many species with this character had been previously placed in *Calyptrella* Naudin, but they are all now treated in *Graffenrieda* (Williams in Fieldiana, Bot. 29: 562–564. 1963; Goldenberg & Meirelles, l.c.). Thus, based on both molecular data and morphological characters, there is no doubt of the position of *Centronia laurifolia* within *Graffenrieda*. Of the remaining four species in *Centronia* not yet included in molecular phylogenetic analyses, one (*C. sessilifolia* Cogn.) may be better placed in *Meriania*, while the other three have staminal characters consistent with *Graffenrieda* (Wurdack, l.c. 1976; Mendoza & Fernández, l.c.).

Following nomenclatural priority, 70 species of *Graffenrieda* would require new combinations or new names in *Centronia* in order to achieve monophyletic genera. Because *Graffenrieda* is more widely distributed and many species are locally common, many tropical botanists and *Melastomataceae* specialists are familiar with this genus, while the knowledge and distribution of *Centronia* is more limited. Moreover, the concept of *Centronia* has probably been more closely associated with species now in *Meriania*, even if the type has characters that place it together with *Graffenrieda*.

In summary, the conservation of *Graffenrieda* in favor of *Centronia* would significantly reduce the number of necessary new combinations or new names (from 70 to at most 4), and the number of specimens affected in herbaria. This action would be in line with other recent conservations in *Melastomataceae* aimed at preserving nomenclatural stability (e.g., Michelangeli & al. in Taxon 65: 892–893. 2016).

Author information
JSM: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4512-5811
FAM: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7348-143X
FA: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4916-8897

(2788) Proposal to reject the name *Radermachia rotunda* (*Artocarpus rotundus*) (*Moraceae*)

Elliot M. Gardner[1,2] & Nyree J.C. Zerega[3,4]

1 *Singapore Botanic Gardens, National Parks Board, 1 Cluny Road, 259569, Singapore*
2 *Institute of Environment, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th Street, OE 148, Miami, Florida 33199, U.S.A.*
3 *The Negaunee Institute for Plant Conservation Science and Action, Chicago Botanic Garden, 1000 Lake Cook Road, Glencoe, Illinois 60022, U.S.A.*
4 *Plant Biology and Conservation, Northwestern University, 2205 Tech Dr., Evanston, Illinois 60208, U.S.A.*
Address for correspondence: *Elliot M. Gardner*, *elliotgardner2012@u.northwestern.edu*

DOI https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12402

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

(2788) ***Radermachia rotunda*** Houtt., Nat. Hist. 2(11): 455. 3 Dec 1779 [Angiosp.: *Mor.*], nom. utique rej. prop.
Typus: non designatus.

The name *Artocarpus rigidus* Blume (Bijdr. Fl. Ned. Ind.: 482. 1825, '*rigida*') (*Moraceae*) has long been in near-exclusive use for a well-known species of wild fruit tree common throughout much of the Malesian region. It has become clear, however, that the earlier *Artocarpus rotundus* (Houtt.) Panzer (in Christmann, Vollst. Pflanzensyst. 10: 380. 1783, '*rotunda*'), based on *Radermachia rotunda* Houtt. (Nat. Hist. 2(11): 455. 1779), likely refers to the same species. To avoid confusion and taxonomic instability, we propose that the name *Radermachia rotunda* be rejected.

No traceable original material exists for *Radermachia rotunda*, despite a recent search at G, where the main part of Houttuyn's herbarium resides (Wijnands & al. in Candollea 72: 155–198. 2017). The brief protologue provided the vernacular name "*Mandelique*" and three diagnostic characters: (1) the leaves are the same as those of *Radermachia integra* Thunb. (= *Artocarpus integer* (Thunb.) Merr.) but without roughness; (2) the pistillate inflorescences are completely round; and (3) the rough fruit grows to the size of a child's head. *Artocarpus rigidus* was validly published over 40 years later with a somewhat more detailed protologue and without mention of *Artocarpus rotundus*. The lectotype, without information on the collector, is preserved at Leiden (Java, barcode L 0039903).

Merrill (in J. Arnold Arbor. 19: 331. 1938), in a paper on Houttuyn's names, concluded, based on the protologue, that *Radermachia rotunda* was the same species as *Artocarpus rigidus*, finding further confirmation in the vernacular name "*mandeliké*" associated by later authors with *A. rigidus* (Koorders & Valeton in Bijdr. Kennis Boomsorten Java 11: 19. 1906; also Hasskarl, Aanteek. Nut Java Pl.: 27. 1845; Teijsmann & Binnendijk, Cat. Hort. Bot. Bogor: 85. 1866). Merrill (l.c.) therefore reduced *Artocarpus rigidus* to synonymy under *Artocarpus rotundus*. In her monograph of *Artocarpus*, Jarrett (in J. Arnold Arbor. 40: 118, 153–154. 1959) disagreed and considered *Radermachia rotunda* Houtt. to be a nomen dubium, noting that although *Mandelique* was a common name for *A. rigidus*, the protologue was too vague because the leaves of that species are abaxially scabrid, and the infructescence is smaller than a child's head. She, therefore, maintained *Artocarpus rigidus* as the accepted name for the species. A more forgiving approach might note that although the leaves of *Artocarpus rigidus* are scabrid abaxially, they are usually (although not always) smooth adaxially, and that larger infructescences may at least attain the size of an infant's (if not a child's) head. Moreover, among the Javan species not separately dealt with by Houttuyn, *Artocarpus rigidus* is really the only good candidate for *Radermachia rotunda*.

Artocarpus rotundus was apparently overlooked by early authors, perhaps, as Merrill speculated, because neither Houttuyn nor Panzer indicated their species as new. Blume's *Artocarpus rigidus*, on the other hand, was widely used and has appeared in all of the major treatments of *Artocarpus* over the past 170 years (Trécul in Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot., sér. 3, 8: 114. 1847; Miquel in Zollinger, Syst. Verz. 2: 89, 95. 1854–1855, Fl. Ned. Ind. 1: 286. 1859, Fl. Ned. Ind., Eerste Bijv.: 418. 1861, in Ann. Mus. Bot. Lugduno-Batavi 3: 211. 1867; King in Hooker, Fl. Brit. India 5: 540. 1888, in Ann. Roy. Bot. Gard. Calcutta 2: 8, t. 3. 1889; Ridley in J. Straits Branch Roy. Asiat. Soc. 33: 147. 1900, Fl. Malay Penins. 3: 352. 1924; Koorders & Valeton, l.c.: 17; Koorders, Exkurs.-Fl. Java 2: 93. 1912; Heyne, Nutt. Pl. Ned.-Ind.: 564. 1927; Burkill, Dict. Econ. Prod. Malay Penins.: 258. 1935; Corner, Wayside Trees Malaya: 657, t. 198, 199. 1940; Browne, Forest Trees Sarawak Brunei: 353. 1955; Jarrett, l.c.: 150; Kochummen, Tree Fl. Malaya 3: 131, t. 6. 1978, Tree Fl. Sabah Sarawak 3: 208, t. 5. 2000; Berg & al., Fl. Males., Ser. 1, 17(1): 100. 2006, Fl. Thailand 10(4): 17. 2011). By contrast, no modern treatments of *Artocarpus* have taken up Merrill's approach, and *Artocarpus rotundus* remains an obscure name that likely applies to a well-known species.

Failure to reject *Radermachia rotunda* would uphold the principle of priority but would also promote nomenclatural instability and confusion. Because opinions have differed as to the application of the name, future authors who consider the protologue sufficient to equate the name with *Artocarpus rigidus* may feel compelled to follow Merrill and adopt *A. rotundus*, even while authors who agree with Jarrett continue to use *A. rigidus*. Rejecting *Radermachia rotunda* would eliminate that possibility and promote stability in the nomenclature of this species.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank John McNeill for helpful consultation in preparing this proposal and Fred Stauffer for checking specimens at G. This research was supported by the US National Science Foundation (DBI 1711391) and the National Parks Board of Singapore.

(2789) Proposal to conserve the name *Pomaderris kumarahou* (*Rhamnaceae*) with that spelling

Peter J. de Lange,[1] Sergei L. Mosyakin,[2] Shannel P. Courtney[3] & Te Ahu Rei[4]

1 *School of Environmental & Animal Sciences, Unitec Institute of Technology, Private Bag 92025, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142, Aotearoa / New Zealand*

2 *M.G. Kholodny Institute of Botany, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Tereshchenkivska Street 2, Kyiv (Kiev) 01004, Ukraine*

3 *Whakatū / Nelson Office, Department of Conservation, Private Bag 5, Nelson, Aotearoa / New Zealand*

4 *Ngāti Tama ki Te Waipounamu Trust, P.O. Box 914, Nelson 7040, Aotearoa / New Zealand*

Address for correspondence: *Sergei L. Mosyakin*, *s_mosyakin@hotmail.com*

DOI https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12403

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

(2789) ***Pomaderris kumarahou*** A. Cunn. in Ann. Nat. Hist. 3: 248. Jun 1839 ('*kumeraho*') [Angiosp.: *Rhamn.*], nom. & orth. cons. prop.

Typus: [New Zealand, North Island, Bay of Islands] Keri-Keri, at head of boat navigation, Sep 1826, *A. Cunningham 36/58*