In the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012), “name of a new taxon” is defined in Art. 6.9, as follows: “The name of a new taxon (e.g. genus novum, gen. nov., species nova, sp. nov.) is a name validly published in its own right, i.e. one not based on a previously validly published name”. However, the final clause, “it is not a new combination, a name at new rank, or a replacement name”, is so inconspicuous and fuzzy that it was overlooked not only by taxonomists but also by two nomenclature gurus. The following new wording is therefore proposed.

(091) Change Art. 6.9, as follows (new text in bold):

“6.9. The name of a new taxon (e.g. genus novum, gen. nov., species nova, sp. nov.) is a name validly published in its own right, i.e. one not based on a previously validly published name; a name validly published as a new combination, a name at new rank, or a replacement name in accordance with Art. 41 is not the name of a new taxon.”

If this proposal is accepted, the definition in the Glossary will also need to be amended editorially.