Taxonomic Note

Are the concepts of legitimate and illegitimate names necessary under the current International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria? A proposal to make changes to the Code

B. J. Tindall

DSMZ – Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH, Inhoffenstr. 7B, D-38124 Braunschweig, Germany

Correspondence
B. J. Tindall
bti@dsmz.de

The International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria (the Code) has retained the concept of legitimate and illegitimate names, despite the fact that the principle underlying valid publication of a name could easily dispense with this concept. Furthermore, changes in wording to the Code are proposed that would help to clarify the issue of names that contravene the Code.

The International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria (the Code; Lapage *et al.*, 1992) has retained the concept of legitimate and illegitimate, defining these terms under Rule 23a Note 5. Names and epithets may be:

legitimate – in accordance with the Rules;

illegitimate – contrary to the Rules.

Section 8 also deals with illegitimate names. However, it is clear that the wording is not always in accord with the underlying definitions, or that one may simply replace the concept of illegitimate names with the requirement that only names that are in accordance with the Code may be validly published. The problem then arises that it would appear that an illegitimate name may be validly published, but at the same time such a name cannot be used as a correct name. Thus, one is left with the paradox that there are instances where a taxon is given a validly published name but, because it is illegitimate, that name cannot be used. In the majority of cases, the situation would be clarified if only names that are in accordance with the Rules can be validly published, thus making the terms legitimate and illegitimate superfluous. In addition, this would have the effect of removing an ambiguity in the Code. Some changes to the wording of the Code with regards the use of the terms legitimate/illegitimate have been accepted by the Judicial Commission and the International Committee on Systematics of Prokaryotes (ICSP) (De Vos & Trüper, 2000; Tindall *et al.*, 2008).

Principle 8 states:

> 'Each order or taxon of a lower rank with a given **circumscription**, **position**, and **rank** can bear only one correct name, i.e. the earliest that is in accordance with the Rules of this Code. Provision has been made for exceptions to this Principle (see Rules 23a and 23b and the Statutes of the ICSP/ICSB).'

Rule 23a states:

> 'Each taxon above species, up to and including order, with a given circumscription, position, and rank can bear only one correct name, that is, the earliest that is in accordance with the Rules of this Code.'

Rule 23a Note 5 may be altered as follows:

> '*Note 5.* Names and epithets may be:
>
> **effectively published** – in printed **or electronic** matter made generally available to the scientific community (see Rule 25);
>
> **validly published** – effectively published and accompanied by a description of the taxon or a reference to a description and certain other requirements (see Rules 27–32); such names must be in accordance with the Rules. Names contrary to the Rules cannot be validly published.'
>
> **correct** – the name which, **according to a given taxonomic opinion**, must be adopted for a taxon under the Rules.

Other instances where the terms legitimate/legitimate may be replaced/removed are listed below.

Recommendation 10a

> 'The following Recommendations apply when forming new generic or subgeneric names.
>
> (3) Avoid introducing into bacteriology as generic names such names as are in use in botany or zoology, in particular well-known names. With effect from the present Code such homonyms are illegitimate [see Principle 2 and Rule 51b (4), which are not retroactive].'

This may be changed to:

'(3) Avoid introducing into bacteriology as generic names such names as are in use in botany or zoology, in particular well-known names. With effect from the present Code such homonyms are **contrary to this Code** [see Principle 2 and Rule 51b (4), which are not retroactive].'

Rule 20a

'The nomenclatural type of a genus or subgenus is the type species, that is, the single species or one of the species included when the name was originally validly published. Only species whose names are legitimate may serve as types.'

This may be changed to:

'The nomenclatural type of a genus or subgenus is the type species, that is, the single species or one of the species included when the name was originally validly published. Only species whose names are **validly published** may serve as types.'

Rule 21a

'The nomenclatural type of a taxon above genus, up to and including order, is the (legitimate name of the [included] genus on whose name) genus on whose name the name of the relevant taxon is based. One taxon of each category must include the type genus. The names of the taxa which include the type genus must be formed by the addition of the appropriate suffix to the stem of the name of the type genus (see Rule 9).'

This may be changed to:

'The nomenclatural type of a taxon above genus, up to and including order, is the (**validly published** name of the [included] genus on whose name) genus on whose name the name of the relevant taxon is based. One taxon of each category must include the type genus. The names of the taxa which include the type genus must be formed by the addition of the appropriate suffix to the stem of the name of the type genus (see Rule 9).'

Rule 23b

'The date of a name or epithet is that of its valid publication. For purposes of priority, however, only legitimate names and epithets are taken into consideration (see Rules 32b and 54).'

This may be changed to:

'The date of a name or epithet is that of its valid publication. For purposes of priority, however, only **validly published** names and epithets are taken into consideration (see Rules 32b and 54).'

Rule 31a

'The name of a species or a subspecies is not validly published if the description is demonstrably ambiguous and cannot be critically identified for purposes of the precise application of the name of a taxon.

Examples: '*Methanobacillus omelianskii*', whose description included all component species, was treated as a single species and was thus illegitimate. *Syntrophobacter wolinii* (Boone and Bryant 1984) is legitimate, because the species description applies to one member of the syntrophic association with a hydrogen-producing organism.'

This may be changed to:

'The name of a species or a subspecies is not validly published if the description is demonstrably ambiguous and cannot be critically identified for purposes of the precise application of the name of a taxon.

Examples: '*Methanobacillus omelianskii*', whose description included all component species, was treated as a single species and was thus **not validly published**. *Syntrophobacter wolinii* Boone and Bryant 1984 is **validly published**, because the species description applies to one member of the syntrophic association with a hydrogen-producing organism'.

Rule 32b

[See also Rule 27 Note 2, but this only rules against valid publication of the genus name, not of the epithet.]

'A specific (or subspecific) epithet is not rendered illegitimate by publication in a species (or subspecies) name in which the generic name is illegitimate (see also Chapter 3, Section 8, and example for Rule 20f).'

This may be changed to:

'A **validly published** specific (or subspecific) epithet is not rendered not **validly published** by **subsequent** publication in a species (or subspecies) name in which the generic name is **not validly published** (see also Chapter 3, Section 8, and example for Rule 20f).'

Either a note should be added, or this alternative wording used:

'A **validly published** specific (or subspecific) epithet can only be validly published if it is validly published as part of a combination (see Rule 54). It is not rendered not **validly published if subsequently transferred to** a species (or subspecies) name in which the generic name is **not validly published** (see also Chapter 3, Section 8, and example for Rule 20f).'

Rule 41a

'When a species is transferred to another genus without any change of rank, the specific epithet

must be retained, or if it has not been retained (in a previous publication), it must be re-established, unless: (see Rule 23a Note 1)

(2) There is available an earlier validly published and legitimate specific or subspecific epithet.

Example: Not yet found.'

This may be changed to:

'(2) There is available an earlier **validly published** specific or subspecific epithet.

Example: Not yet found.'

Rule 42

'In the case of subspecies, species, subgenera, and genera, if two or more of those taxa of the same rank are united, the oldest legitimate name or epithet is retained.'

This may be changed to:

'In the case of subspecies, species, subgenera and genera, if two or more of those taxa of the same rank are united, the oldest **validly published** name or epithet is retained.'

Recommendation 42

'*Note:* By the oldest legitimate epithet is meant that which is in accordance with the Rules. When type of the genus, subgenus, or species is involved the oldest legitimate epithet is that which is in accordance with Rule 15.'

This may be changed to:

'*Note:* By the oldest **validly published** epithet is meant that which is in accordance with the Rules. When type of the genus, subgenus or species is involved, the oldest **validly published** epithet is that which is in accordance with Rule 15.'

Rule 44

'If two or more species of different genera are brought together to form a genus, and if these species include the type species of one or more genera, the name of the genus is that associated with the type species having the earliest legitimate generic name. If no type species is placed in the genus, a new generic name must be proposed and a type species selected.'

This may be changed to:

'If two or more species of different genera are brought together to form a genus, and if these species include the type species of one or more genera, the name of the genus is that associated with the type species having the earliest **validly published** generic name. If no type species is placed in the genus, a new generic name must be proposed and a type species selected.'

The following Rules are numbered consistent with the published version of the 1990 revision of the Code (Lapage *et al.*, 1992).

Rule 47a

'When two or more taxa of the same rank from subtribe to family inclusive are united under a taxon of higher rank, the higher-ranking taxon should derive its name from the name of the earliest legitimate genus that is a type genus of one of the lower-ranking taxa.'

This may be changed to:

'When two or more taxa of the same rank from subtribe to family inclusive are united under a taxon of higher rank, the higher-ranking taxon should derive its name from the earliest **validly published** genus **name** that is a type genus of one of the lower-ranking taxa.'

Rule 50a

'When a subspecies is elevated in rank to a species, the subspecific epithet in the name of the subspecies must be used as the specific epithet of the name of the species unless the resulting combination is illegitimate.

Example: *Campylobacter pylori* subsp. *mustelae* Fox *et al.* 1988 becomes *Campylobacter mustelae* (Fox *et al.* 1988) Fox *et al.* 1989.'

This may be changed to:

'When a subspecies is elevated in rank to a species, the subspecific epithet in the name of the subspecies must be used as the specific epithet of the name of the species unless the resulting combination is **contrary to the Rules**.

Example: *Campylobacter pylori* subsp. *mustelae* Fox *et al.* 1988 becomes *Campylobacter mustelae* (Fox *et al.* 1988) Fox *et al.* 1989.'

Rule 50b

'When a species is lowered in rank to a subspecies, the specific epithet in the name of the species must be used as the subspecific epithet of the name of the subspecies unless the resulting combination is illegitimate.

Example: *Bifidobacterium globosum* (*ex* Scardovi *et al.* 1969) Biavati *et al.* 1982 becomes *Bifidobacterium pseudolongum* subsp. *globosum* (Biavati *et al.* 1982) Yaeshima *et al.* 1992.'

This may be changed to:

'When a species is lowered in rank to a subspecies, the specific epithet in the name of the species must be used as the subspecific epithet of the name of the subspecies unless the resulting combination is **contrary to the Rules**.

Example: *Bifidobacterium globosum* (*ex* Scardovi *et al.* 1969) Biavati *et al.* 1982 becomes *Bifidobacterium pseudolongum* subsp. *globosum* (Biavati *et al.* 1982) Yaeshima *et al.* 1992.'

Rule 51a

'A name contrary to a Rule is illegitimate and may not be used. However, a name of a taxon which is illegitimate when the taxon is in one taxonomic position is not necessarily illegitimate when the taxon is in another taxonomic position.

Example: If the genus *Diplococcus* Weichselbaum 1886 is combined with the genus *Streptococcus* Rosenbach 1884, *Diplococcus* is illegitimate as the name of the combined genus because it is not the earlier name. If the genus *Diplococcus* Weichselbaum is accepted as separate and distinct, then the name *Diplococcus* is legitimate.'

The example given is misleading, since it relates to an incorrect taxonomic interpretation. Once a name is legitimate (or validly published) it should remain so, unless it becomes a rejected name. Creating a combination that is contrary to the Rules does not affect the status of the original genus names or the epithets, although the creation of any new combinations would make those combinations illegitimate or, as proposed here, not validly published.

The wording of Rule 51a may be simplified as follows:

'A name contrary to a Rule may not be validly published.'

Rule 51b

'Among the reasons for which a name may be illegitimate are the following.

(1) If the taxon to which the name was applied, as circumscribed by the author, included the nomenclatural type of a name which the author ought to have adopted under one or more of the Rules.

Example: If an author circumscribes a genus to include *Bacillus subtilis*, the type species of the genus *Bacillus*, then the circumscribed genus must be named *Bacillus*.

(2) If the author did not adopt for a binary or ternary combination the earliest legitimate generic name, specific epithet, or subspecific epithet available for the taxon with its particular circumscription, position, and rank.

Example: The name *Bacillus whitmori* Bergey *et al.* 1930 was illegitimate as Whitmore had named the organism *Bacillus pseudomallei* in 1903.

(3) If its specific epithet must be rejected under Rules 52 or 53.

(4) If it is a **later** homonym of a name of a taxon of prokaryotes, fungi, algae, protozoa, or viruses.

Example: *Phytomonas* Donovan 1909, a genus of flagellates, antedates *Phytomonas* Bergey *et al.* 1923, a genus of prokaryote (Opinion 14).

Names of prokaryote validly published under this revision of the Code are not to be rejected as homonyms of names of prokaryote published before 1980 and omitted from the Approved Lists.'

This may be changed to:

'Among the reasons for which a name **is contrary to the Rules are**:

(1) If the taxon to which the name was applied, as circumscribed by the author, included the nomenclatural type of a name which the author ought to have adopted under one or more of the Rules.

Example: If an author circumscribes a genus to include *Bacillus subtilis*, the type species of the genus *Bacillus*, then the circumscribed genus must be named *Bacillus*.

(2) If the author did not adopt for a binary or ternary combination the earliest **validly published** generic name, specific epithet or subspecific epithet available for the taxon with its particular circumscription, position and rank.

Example: The name *Bacillus whitmori* Bergey *et al.* 1930 cannot **be validly published** as Whitmore had named the organism *Bacillus pseudomallei* in 1903.

(3) If its specific epithet must be rejected under Rules 52 or 53.

(4) **Until 31 December 2000,** if it is a **later** homonym of a name of a taxon of prokaryotes, fungi, algae, protozoa or viruses.

After 31 December 2000, if it is a later homonym of a name validly published under this Code, or a name covered by the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature or the International Code of Virus Classification and Nomenclature.

Example: *Phytomonas* Donovan 1909, a genus of flagellates, antedates *Phytomonas* Bergey *et al.* 1923, a genus of prokaryote (Opinion 14).

Names of prokaryote validly published under this revision of the Code are not to be **treated** as homonyms of names of prokaryote published before 1980 and omitted from the Approved Lists.'

Rule 53

'An epithet is illegitimate if it duplicates a specific or subspecific epithet previously validly published for a species or subspecies of the same genus but which is a different bacterium whose name is based upon another type.

Example: *Corynebacterium helvolum* (Zimmermann 1890) Kisskalt and Berend 1918 is based on the type

of *Bacillus helvolus* Zimmermann 1890; the specific epithet *helvolum* cannot be used for *Corynebacterium helvolum* Jensen 1934, which is a different bacterium whose name is based upon another type.'

This may be changed to:

'An epithet is **contrary to this Code** if it duplicates a specific or subspecific epithet previously validly published for a species or subspecies of the same genus but which is a different bacterium whose name is based upon another type.

Example: *Corynebacterium helvolum* (Zimmermann 1890) Kisskalt and Berend 1918 is based on the type of *Bacillus helvolus* Zimmermann 1890; the specific epithet *helvolum* cannot be used for *Corynebacterium helvolum* Jensen 1934, which is a different bacterium, **placed in the same genus**, whose name is based upon another type.'

Rule 54

'A name or epithet illegitimate according to Rules 51b, 53, or 56a is replaced by the oldest legitimate name or epithet in a binary or ternary combination which in the new position will be in accordance with the Rules. If no legitimate name or epithet exists, one must be chosen. Since a specific epithet is not rendered illegitimate by publication in a species name in which the generic name is illegitimate (Rule 32b), an author may use such an epithet if he wishes, provided that there is no obstacle to its employment in the new position or sense; the resultant combination is treated as a new name and is to be ascribed to the author of the combination. The epithet is, however, ascribed to the original author.

Example: *Pfeifferella pseudomallei* (Whitmore 1913) Ford 1928 is an illegitimate combination since *Pfeifferella* is a homonym of a protozoan generic name (Opinion 14). The epithet *pseudomallei* can be used for this organism in another genus, *Pseudomonas pseudomallei* (Whitmore 1913) Haynes 1957.'

This may be changed to:

'A name or epithet **contrary to the Rules** according to Rule 51b, 53 or 56a is replaced by the oldest **validly published** name or epithet in a binary or ternary combination which in the new position will be in accordance with the Rules. If no **validly published** name or epithet exists, one must be chosen. Since a specific epithet is not rendered **not validly published** by publication in a species name in which the generic name is **not validly published** (Rule 32b), an author may use such an epithet if he wishes, provided that there is no obstacle to its employment in the new position or sense; the resultant combination is treated as a new name and is to be ascribed to the author of the combination. The epithet is, however, ascribed to the original author.

Example: **the combination** *Pfeifferella pseudomallei* (Whitmore 1913) Ford 1928 is **not validly published** since *Pfeifferella* is a homonym of a protozoan generic name (Opinion 14). The epithet *pseudomallei* can be used for this organism in another genus, *Pseudomonas pseudomallei* (Whitmore 1913) Haynes 1957.'

The wording of Rule 27 Note 2 indicates:

'When a new species or a new combination results in the proposal of a new genus, both the genus name and the new species name or new combination must be validly published. Valid publication of the new species or new combination alone does not constitute valid publication of the new genus.'

Due consideration should be given to the fact that it may be sensible to alter the wording of the Code to clarify whether a species or subspecies epithet may be validly published if, at the time they were created, the genus name and resulting combination are not validly published.

Rule 55

'A legitimate name or epithet may not be replaced merely because of the following.'

This may be changed to:

'A **validly published** name or epithet may not be replaced merely because of the following.'

Rule 56b

'**A conserved name** (*nomen conservandum*) is a name which must be used instead of all earlier synonyms and homonyms.

Note 1. A conserved name (*nomen conservandum*) is conserved against all other names for the taxon, whether these are cited in the corresponding list of rejected names or not, so long as the taxon concerned is not united with another taxon bearing a legitimate name. In the event of union or reunion with another taxon, the earlier of the two competing names is adopted in accordance with Rules 23a, b.

Note 2. Only the Judicial Commission can place names on the list of conserved names (*nomina conservanda*) (see also Rule 23a, Note 4, and Appendix 4).'

This may be changed to:

'**A conserved name** (*nomen conservandum*) is a name which must be used instead of all earlier synonyms and homonyms.

Note 1. A conserved name (*nomen conservandum*) is conserved against all other names for the taxon, whether these are cited in the corresponding list of rejected names or not, so long as the taxon concerned

is not united with another taxon bearing a **validly published** name. In the event of union or reunion with another taxon, the earlier of the two competing names is adopted in accordance with Rules 23a, b.

Note 2. Only the Judicial Commission can place names on the list of conserved names (*nomina conservanda*) (see also Rule 23a, Note 4, and Appendix 4).'

Headings under Section 8

The following headings under Section 8 should be changed:

'Section 8. Illegitimate Names and Epithets: Replacement, Rejection, and Conservation of Names and Epithets'

may be changed to:

'Section 8. Names and Epithets Contrary to this Code: Replacement, Rejection, and Conservation of Names and Epithets'

'Illegitimate Names'

may be changed to:

'Names that are contrary to this Code'

'Illegitimate Epithets'

may be changed to

'Epithets that are Contrary to this Code'.

Principle 6

'The correct name of a taxon is based upon **valid publication**, **legitimacy,** and **priority of publication** (see Chapter 3, Section 5).'

This may be changed to:

'The correct name of a taxon is based upon **valid publication** and **priority of publication** (see Chapter 3, Section 5).'

Consequences

The proposals listed above would have the effect of making those names that are currently considered to be illegitimate not validly published. It is evident that a number of names already contravene the Code and, although they are illegitimate, they are in widely accepted usage. An undesirable effect of the change in wording would be to make a number of names in common usage not validly published. In such cases, the Judicial Commission can set aside the Rules of the Code and make exceptions as laid down by Rule 3 of the Code (Lapage *et al.*, 1992). This course of action is strongly recommended where appropriate. Some examples are given below.

The genus name *Rhizomonas*

The name is associated with a protist genus *Rhizomonas* Kent 1880 (although this name is not a name in current usage in botany: see http://botany.si.edu/ing/ and http://www.bgbm.org/iapt/ncu/genera/NCUGQuery.htm) and is associated with the prokaryote genus '*Rhizomonas*' Orla-Jensen 1909 (Buchanan *et al.*, 1966). The prokaryote genus name appears in Opinion 14 (Lapage *et al.*, 1992) as a rejected name. The name '*Rhizomonas*' Orla-Jensen 1909 is not considered to be a homonym according to Rule 51b (4) (Lapage *et al.*, 1992). It has, however, been used again as *Rhizomonas* van Bruggen *et al.* 1990, although the name remains illegitimate. The combination *Rhizomonas suberifaciens* van Bruggen *et al.* 1990 is also illegitimate, although, according to Rule 53, the epithet is not illegitimate. This taxon has been transferred to *Sphingomonas suberifaciens* (van Bruggen *et al.*, 1990) Yabuuchi *et al.* 1999. However, if the relevant Rules were to be changed to dispose of the principle of illegitimate and legitimate names and to require that only names in accordance with the Rules can be validly published, there would be a number of consequences. The genus name *Rhizomonas* van Bruggen *et al.* 1990 is also an earlier heterotypic synonym of the genus name *Sphingomonas* Yabuuchi *et al.* 1990 (van Bruggen *et al.*, 1990; Yabuuchi *et al.*, 1990a, b, 1999a, b). Due consideration should also be given to whether a species or subspecies epithet can be validly published if the genus name and resulting combination are not validly published (see additional text under Rule 54).

Rhizomonas van Bruggen *et al.* 1990 – not validly published;

Rhizomonas suberifaciens van Bruggen *et al.* 1990 – not validly published;

suberifaciens van Bruggen *et al.* 1990 – not validly published;

Sphingomonas suberifaciens Yabuuchi *et al.* 1999 – validly published.

In this form, the citation of the names would not make reference to names (or epithets) that are not validly published, but reference may, of course, be made to a previously effective publication of a description in van Bruggen *et al.* (1990) in the protologue that appears in Yabuuchi *et al.* (1999a), which would be indirectly referenced via publication of the name on Validation List 70 (Yabuuchi *et al.*, 1999b), and this interpretation conforms to the wording of Rule 27. However, it would have an influence on the date of priority of the epithet.

Alternatively:

Rhizomonas van Bruggen *et al.* 1990 – not validly published;

Rhizomonas suberifaciens van Bruggen *et al.* 1990 – not validly published;

suberifaciens van Bruggen *et al.* 1990 – validly published;

Sphingomonas suberifaciens (van Bruggen *et al.* 1990) Yabuuchi *et al.* 1999 – validly published.

Synonymy of the names *Deleya aesta* and *Alcaligenes aquamarina* and transfer to the genus *Halomonas*

Deleya aesta (Baumann *et al.* 1972) Baumann *et al.* 1983 – validly published;

Alcaligenes aquamarina ZoBell and Upham 1944 (Approved Lists 1980) – validly published;

Deleya aquamarina (ZoBell and Upham 1944) Akagawa and Yamasato 1989 – validly published.

These taxa have been treated as heterotypic synonyms (Akagawa & Yamasato, 1989) and also transferred to the genus *Halomonas* (Dobson & Franzmann, 1996). Were the name *Halomonas aesta* to be proposed, the combination would not be validly published, although both the genus name *Halomonas* and the epithet *aesta* (originally validly published as *Alcaligenes aesta*) would remain validly published. The name of the species is *Halomonas aquamarina*, as validly published (Dobson & Franzmann, 1996).

The species name *Neisseria weaveri*

The names *Neisseria weaveri* Holmes *et al.* 1993 and *Neisseria weaveri* Andersen *et al.* 1993 are homonyms and refer to the same taxon (Holmes *et al.*, 1993; Andersen *et al.*, 1993a, b) [note: the authority of the latter name was erroneously given as Anderson *et al.* 1993 in Validation List no. 47 (Andersen *et al.*, 1993b)]. At present, the name *Neisseria weaveri* Andersen *et al.* 1993 is illegitimate but, under the new wording, would be considered to be not validly published.

The genus name *Rhodococcus*

The genus *Rhodococcus* Zopf 1891 appeared on the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names (Skerman *et al.*, 1980, 1989) but, as a known homonym of the algal genus *Rhodococcus* Hansgirg 1884 (http://botany.si.edu/ing/; http://www.bgbm.org/iapt/ncu/genera/NCUGQuery.htm), is contrary to the Rules, is illegitimate and cannot serve as a correct name. The genus name '*Rhodococcus*' Molisch 1907 (Buchanan *et al.*, 1966) referred to a phototrophic bacterium. The name '*Rhodococcus*' Molisch 1907 is not considered to be a homonym according to Rule 51b (4) (Lapage *et al.*, 1992). Under the new wording, the name *Rhodococcus* Zopf 1891 would be considered to be not validly published, a consequence that would affect the combinations of all species included in this prokaryote genus. Under the present wording of the Code since 1975 (Lapage *et al.*, 1975, 1992; De Vos & Trüper, 2000), the name *Rhodococcus* Zopf 1891 is illegitimate and cannot serve as a correct name, already creating a problem that needs to be solved. The alternative would be to make an exception to the Rules and to rule that the name *Rhodococcus* Zopf 1891 is to be treated as validly published under the Code despite the fact that it is a later homonym of an algal taxon.

In the case of other names that are illegitimate, the change in wording that makes them not validly published should have little effect on the usage of these names since they currently do not qualify to be used as correct names. Should cases be discovered where this is not the case (although the use of such names already contravenes the Code), the matter can be referred to the Judicial Commission.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank John McNeill, Royal Botanical Gardens, Edinburgh, for comment on the principle of legitimate and illegitimate names under the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature.

References

Akagawa, M. & Yamasato, K. (1989). Synonymy of *Alcaligenes aquamarinus*, *Alcaligenes faecalis* subsp. *homari*, and *Deleya aesta*: *Deleya aquamarina* comb. nov. as the type species of the genus *Deleya*. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **39**, 462–466.

Andersen, B. M., Steigerwalt, A. G., O'Connor, S. P., Hollis, D. G., Weyant, R. S., Weaver, R. E. & Brenner, D. J. (1993a). *Neisseria weaveri* sp. nov., formerly CDC group M-5, a gram-negative bacterium associated with dog bite wounds. *J Clin Microbiol* **31**, 2456–2466.

Andersen, B. M., Steigerwalt, A. G., O'Connor, S. P., Hollis, D. G., Weyant, R. S., Weaver, R. E. & Brenner, D. J. (1993b). *Neisseria weaveri* sp. nov. In *Validation of the Publication of New Names and New Combinations Previously Effectively Published Outside the IJSB*, List no. 47. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **43**, 864–865.

Buchanan, R. E., Holt, J. G. & Lessel, E. F., Jr (editors) (1966). *Index Bergeyana: an Annotated Alphabetic Listing of Names of the Taxa of the Bacteria*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

De Vos, P. & Trüper, H. G. (2000). Judicial Commission of the International Committee on Systematic Bacteriology. IXth International (IUMS) Congress of Bacteriology and Applied Microbiology. Minutes of the meetings, 14, 15 and 18 August 1999, Sydney, Australia. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **50**, 2239–2244.

Dobson, S. J. & Franzmann, P. D. (1996). Unification of the genera *Deleya* (Baumann et al. 1983), *Halomonas* (Vreeland et al. 1980), and *Halovibrio* (Fendrich 1988) and the species *Paracoccus halodenitrificans* (Robinson and Gibbons 1952) into a single genus, *Halomonas*, and placement of the genus *Zymobacter* in the family *Halomonadaceae*. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **46**, 550–558.

Holmes, B., Costas, M., On, S. L. W., Vandamme, P., Falsen, E. & Kersters, K. (1993). *Neisseria weaveri* sp. nov. (formerly CDC group M-5), from dog bite wounds of humans. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **43**, 687–693.

Lapage, S. P., Sneath, P. H. A., Lessel, E. F., Skerman, V. B. D., Seeliger, H. P. R. & Clark, W. A. (editors) (1975). *International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria (1975 Revision). Bacteriological Code.* Washington, DC: American Society for Microbiology.

Lapage, S. P., Sneath, P. H. A., Lessel, E. F., Skerman, V. B. D., Seeliger, H. P. R. & Clark, W. A. (editors) (1992). *International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria (1990 Revision). Bacteriological Code.* Washington, DC: American Society for Microbiology.

Skerman, V. B. D., McGowan, V. & Sneath, P. H. A. (editors) (1980). Approved lists of bacterial names. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **30**, 225–420.

Skerman, V. B. D., McGowan, V. & Sneath, P. H. A. (editors) (1989). *Approved Lists of Bacterial Names (Amended Edition)*. Washington, DC: American Society for Microbiology.

Tindall, B. J., De Vos, P. & Trüper, H. G. (2008). Judicial Commission of the International Committee on Systematics of Prokaryotes. XIth International (IUMS) Congress of Bacteriology and Applied Microbiology. Minutes of the meetings, 23, 24 and 27 July 2005, San Francisco, CA, USA. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **58**, 1737–1745.

van Bruggen, A. H. C., Jochimsen, K. N. & Brown, P. R. (1990). *Rhizomonas suberifaciens* gen. nov., sp. nov., the causal agent of corky root of lettuce. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **40**, 175–188.

Yabuuchi, E., Yano, I., Oyaizu, H., Hashimoto, Y., Ezaki, T. & Yamamoto, H. (1990a). Proposals of *Sphingomonas paucimobilis* gen. nov. and comb. nov., *Sphingomonas parapaucimobilis* sp. nov., *Sphingomonas yanoikuyae* sp. nov., *Sphingomonas adhaesiva* sp. nov., *Sphingomonas capsulata* comb. nov., and two genospecies of the genus *Sphingomonas*. *Microbiol Immunol* **34**, 99–119.

Yabuuchi, E., Yano, I., Oyaizu, H., Hashimoto, Y., Ezaki, T. & Yamamoto, H. (1990b). *Sphingomonas* gen. nov. In *Validation of the Publication of New Names and New Combinations Previously Effectively Published Outside the IJSB*, List no. 34. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **40**, 320–321.

Yabuuchi, E., Kosako, Y., Naka, T., Suzuki, S. & Yano, I. (1999a). Proposal of *Sphingomonas suberifaciens* (van Bruggen, Jochimsen and Brown 1990) comb. nov., *Sphingomonas natatoria* (Sly 1985) comb. nov., *Sphingomonas ursincola* (Yurkov *et al.* 1997) comb. nov., and emendation of the genus *Sphingomonas*. *Microbiol Immunol* **43**, 339–349.

Yabuuchi, E., Kosako, Y., Naka, T., Suzuki, S. & Yano, I. (1999b). *Sphingomonas suberifaciens* comb. nov. In *Validation of the Publication of New Names and New Combinations Previously Effectively Published Outside the IJSB*, List no. 70. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **49**, 935–936.