

(1546) Proposal to conserve the name *Sagittaria guyanensis* (Alismataceae) with that spelling

Robert W. Gituru, Qing-Feng Wang, Yong Wang & You-Hao Guo

College of Life Sciences, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, P. R. China. E-mail: gituru67@hotmail.com; Wangqf97@public.wh.hb.cn (author for correspondence); wyfree@whu.edu.cn; yhguo@whu.edu.cn

- (1546) *Sagittaria guyanensis* Kunth in Humboldt & al., Nov. Gen. Sp. 1, ed. 4^o: 250; ed. f^o: 199. 1816 ('*guayanensis*') [*Monocot.: Alismat.*], *nom. & orth. cons. prop.*
Lectotypus (vide Lot & Novelo in Davidse & al., Fl. Mesoamer. 6: 6. 1994): Venezuela, "Crescit in paludibus Provinciae Guayanensis propter El Trapiche de Don Felix Farreras, et urbem Angosturae", Jun 1800, *Humboldt & Bonpland s.n.* (B-W No. 17559).

Sagittaria guyanensis is a widely distributed species occurring in tropical regions of Asia, Africa and America. It occurs in two subspecies: *S. guyanensis* subsp. *guayanensis* from the tropical zone of the New World and *S. guyanensis* subsp. *lappula* (D. Don) Bogin from the Old World. The binomial *Sagittaria guyanensis* was validly published by Kunth (in Humboldt, Bonpland and Kunth, Nov. Gen. Sp. 1: 250, ed. 4^o. 1816). The type was collected by Humboldt and Bonpland in the Venezuelan Guayana¹. The original spelling of the specific epithet in the protologue was "*guayanensis*" and had been in use until Buchenau (in Engler, Pflanzenr. IV.15 (Heft 16): 36. 1903) changed it to "*guyanensis*". Hartog (in Van Steenis, Fl. Malesiana ser. I, 5: 328. 1957) stated the reason for the change effected by Buchenau as being the need to ease pronun-

ciation of the epithet, presumably for native speakers of European languages. Several authors of major taxonomic references have followed Buchenau in using the transformed spelling of the epithet. They include Bogin (in Mem. New York Bot. Gard. 2: 179–233. 1955), Rataj (in Annot. Zool. Bot. 76: 1–31. 1972; *ibid.*, 78: 1–43. 1972), Richard (in Kunth, Enum. Pl. 3: 158. 1841) and D'Arcy (Fl. Panama Checklist and Index. Part II: Index 553. 1987). Some other authors have retained the original spelling of the epithet. They include Hartog (*l.c.*) [indicating transformed spelling], Ridley (Fl. Malay Penins. 4: 362–363. 1924), Jørgensen and León-Yáñez (Cat. Vasc. Pl. Ecuador: 202. 1999) and Chen (Syst. & Evol. Bot. Stud. On Chinese *Sagittaria*: 12–16. 1989, but with transformed spelling in the appendix).

In total we have found 39 works in which the original spelling *guayanensis* has been used and 44 works in which the orthographic variant *guyanensis* has been used. A Google search of the internet generated similar totals, 38 for the former spelling and 45 for the latter. It appears that both the correct spelling under the ICBN (Greuter & al., Regnum Veg. 138. 2000) and the transformed spelling are commonly used among the wider botanical community but with a preponderance of the latter. We recommend that the current wide usage of the transformed spelling be legalized by conservation.

If this proposal is rejected, then *guayanensis*, the

¹ [Nom. ed. note: Bogin (in Mem. New York Bot. Gard. 9: 192. 1955) incorrectly interpreted the type locality to be in Colombia, as did Haynes & Holm-Nielsen (in Fl. Neotrop. 64: 79. 1994), but Lot & Novelo (in Davidse et al., Fl. Mesoamer. 6: 6. 1994) correctly cited Venezuela. According to Stearn (Humboldt, Bonpland and Kunth and Tropical American Botany: 79, 104. 1968) this locality is likely in the state of Bolívar, Venezuela, as in June or July of 1800 item 365 of Humboldt and Bonpland's itinerary in Venezuela was "Trapiche de Don Felix Farreras" near the city of Angostura (nowadays Ciudad Bolívar), capital of Nueva Guayana. Although material studied by Kunth should be sought in the P-Bonpl. Herbarium according to Rankin Rodríguez and Greuter (in Taxon 50: 1246. 2001), such a specimen has not been found for this taxon, as indicated by Haynes & Holm-Nielsen (*l.c.*). Neither has it been possible to locate the fragment of the holotype at MO reported by Bogin (*l.c.*). The specimen cited above, labelled "*Sagittaria bracteata*" and "Angostura" in the Willdenow Herbarium, must be that indicated as "holotipo" by Lot & Novelo (*l.c.*) from their examination of the B-W microfiche at MEXU. The same microfiche (at USDA) also bears the number 1079, which according to Rankin Rodríguez and Greuter (*l.c.* 1232, 1233) references the field notes of Humboldt and Bonpland that may exist for this species. While the B-W specimen is part of the original material upon which this name was based, it was probably not seen by Kunth, and thus cannot be a holotype. However, Lot and Novelo's citation of this specimen can be treated as a lectotypification under Art. 9.8. — J. H. Wiersema]

original spelling of the specific epithet, will be correct. Arguments against the conservation of the spelling *guyanensis* are that Art. 60.1 requires the retention of the original spelling of a name or epithet except for the correction of typographic or orthographic errors. Since the change of spelling made by Buchenau does not correct any such error, the name with an altered spelling of the epithet is contrary to a rule and cannot be maintained. In the preamble to the ICBN, euphony of names is indicated to be relatively accessory in comparison to the avoidance and rejection of names that may cause error or ambiguity. Article 51.1 prohibits the rejection of an epithet merely because it is disagreeable. Furthermore the epithet with the spelling *guyanensis* is not necessarily any easier to pronounce than *guayanensis*. This is certainly the case for the increasingly large numbers of systematists who are native speakers of African or Asiatic languages.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Huang Shuang-Quan and L. E. Newton for discussion and comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by “State Key Basic Research and Development Plan of China (973)” (Project No. 2000046805) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Project No. 30070055).