

VII. NOMENCLATURAL NOTE ON CARDIOPTERIS

Cardiopteris or Peripterygium (Icacinaceae)

In 1834 Royle (Ill.Him.Bot. p.136) indicated very briefly, but sufficiently, as was not infrequently done in those early days, the characters of a new genus, already recognized but not validly published by Wallich, named Cardiopteris. Under this name it was taken up and fully described and pictured by Blume (Rumphia part 29, Dec.1842-April 1843, p.206) who based a new family on it, Cardiopteridaceae.

Hasskarl described the same plant independently as the type of a new genus for his Cat.Hort.Bog. (1844) 235, naming it Peripterygium. In a precursor to that Catalogue he published this name in advance (in Tijds.Natuurl.Geschied.& Phys. 10, 2nd instalment, March 1843, 142). The date March 1843 is cited by Hasskarl himself, cf. Flora 27 (1844) 583.

If Royle's notes are not considered to be a valid description which seems open to dispute, the question arises which name, Cardiopteris or Peripterygium, has priority, both being in 1843. In all probability Blume's description was published earlier in that year than Hasskarl's.

As a matter of fact Blume accepted Royle's generic name and cited Peripterygium Hassk. as a synonym, referring to the page in Hasskarl's Catalogue (in error 335 instead of 235). As Blume's Rumphia vol.3 part 29 was published a year ear-

lier, it proves that Blume had received from Hasskarl proof sheets of the Catalogue or other pertinent information. This citation is in itself not sufficient to invalidate Blume's name *Cardiopteris*.

Though we are not exactly informed about the month and day of both Hasskarl's and Blume's publications they must be treated as of the same year, according to the Rules; there is a good chance that Blume's will have been earlier.

Hasskarl himself combined the two names, *Cardiopteris* and *Peripterygium* three years later, dropping his own generic name in favour of Blume's, as he says for purpose of priority (*Flora* 30, 1847, 110, footnote 1) but keeping his specific epithet *quinqueloba*. He continues to use *Cardiopteris* later (*Natuurk.Tijd.Ned.Ind.* 10, 1855, 64).

We can therefore not agree with Bullock, who has proposed to accept *Peripterygium* as the correct name (*Kew Bull.* 1957, 356), probably on the erroneous assumption that Blume's paper was published as late as 1847. The correct authority for *Cardiopteris* is to us "Royle em.Bl.".

We have to thank Dr R.Lorentz, of Teyler Library, Haarlem, for bibliographical assistance.

Leyden, December 1959.

R.C.Bakhuizen van den Brink
C.G.G.J.van Steenis