

## (198) Proposal to add a new Example to Article 9.5

**Rajeev Kumar Singh**

*Botanical Survey of India, Southern Regional Centre, TNAU Campus, Lawley Road, Coimbatore – 641 003, Tamil Nadu, India;*  
*rksbsiadsingh@yahoo.co.in*

**DOI** <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/652.38>

The species *Solanum purpureilineatum* was described by Sabnis & Bhatt. (in Bull. Bot. Surv. India 12: 258. 1972), but those authors designated two specimens as types: “INDIA: Gujarat State: Baroda District, Baroda, L. V. Palace compound, 2.10.60, *Sabnis* 2762, 2763 (Herbarium, The M. S. University of Baroda, Holotype)”. The specimens are extant at BARO and both are hand-annotated in pen as “Holotype” by Sabnis. They are evidently part of single gathering, made by same collector at one place and time (see Art. 8.2 and 8.3 footnote). Art. 9.5 rules that “A syntype is any specimen cited in the protologue when there is no holotype, or any one of two or more specimens simultaneously designated in the protologue as types (see also Art. 40 Note 1). Reference to an entire gathering, or a part thereof, is considered citation of the included specimens.” Therefore, *Sabnis* 2762 and *Sabnis* 2763 are syntypes (and a lectotype designation is allowed under Art. 9.2 and 9.11). However, it may be somewhat confusing that they were simultaneously designated as “holotype” of *S. purpureilineatum*, as a name can have only one holotype (Art. 9.1). In this case “holotype” is treated as an error to be corrected under Art. 9.9 to “syntypes”. Moreover, the name was validly published because

the requirements of Art. 40 were met; in particular, Art. 40.2, which permits a type to be indicated “by reference to an entire gathering, or a part thereof, even if it consists of two or more specimens as defined in Art. 8”.

### **(198) Add a new Example after Art. 9 Ex. 3:**

“*Ex. 3bis.* In the protologue of *Solanum purpureilineatum* Sabnis & Bhatt. (1972), two specimens in the same herbarium, collected by the same collector at one place and time were designated as the “holotype”. Because both specimens belong to the same gathering, the name is validly published (see Art. 40.2) and the specimens are in fact syntypes.”

### **Acknowledgements**

I thank Dr. Paramjit Singh, Director, Botanical Survey of India (BSI) for providing facilities, and Prof. John McNeill (E) and Dr. K.N. Gandhi (GH) for suggestions. I am also grateful to N.J. Turland (B) for his suggestions and refining the manuscript.