(89-90) Two proposals to bring Art. 7 into conformity with Principle II

(89) Amend Art. 7.11, before the final parentheses, to read as follows:

“A name typified by the type of an older name but not formed from it (by use of its
generic genitive singular or in the case of a combination by transfer of its epithet) is a
substitute name (nomen novum) for the older name, whether or not it is avowedly
published as such.”

The present wording is logically back to front. The nomen novum is such because it
is typified by the type of the older name; it is not typified by the type of the older name
just because it is a newer name. Its status cannot be ascertained until it is typified
(Principle II).

(90) Amend Art. 7.12, before the final parentheses, to read as follows:

“A legitimate name which later has another homotypic name formed from it, by use
of its generic genitive singular (stat. nov.) or in the case of a combination by use of its
epithet (comb. nov., comb. et stat. nov.), is the basionym of the newer name.”

The same logic applies here. The later name (stat. nov., comb. nov., stat. et comb.
now.) has that status because it is typified by the type of the older name; it is not typified
by the type of the older name just because it has the same generic genitive singular or
epithet. Again, its status cannot be ascertained until it is typified.

This rewording also has the advantage of defining the term “basionym” used but
not at present defined in the Code.

Proposed by: C. Jeffrey, Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9
3AE, U.K.