BACTERIOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
AND TAXONOMYCONCERNING THE CONTROVERSY OVER CONSERVA-
TION OF THE GENERIC NAME BACTERIUM AND THE
FAMILY NAME BACTERIACEAE.

by F. Kauffmann, M. D.

From Statens Seruminstitut, Copenhagen (Chief:
J. Orskov, M. D.)

In order to correct any misconception that the current controversy (1,2) concerning Opinion No. 4 of the Judicial Commission (3) is a matter of importance only to the one bacteriologist who has publicly expressed views dissenting from the opinion, I wish to place myself on record as supporting him without reservation in a request that the opinion be rejected. From my extensive contacts in the field of enteric bacteriology, I know that the views of a large number of American bacteriologists coincide with those expressed by Borman (1) who may be regarded as their unofficial but nevertheless authentic spokesman in this matter. Moreover, I wish to make it plain that dissatisfaction with Opinion No. 4 is not confined to American bacteriologists alone. As a member of the International Committee on Bacteriological Nomenclature, and as cochairman of its Enterobacteriaceae Subcommittee, I have requested a review of Opinion No. 4 by the entire Committee.

The views of the Enterobacteriaceae Subcommittee of the British Advisory Nomenclature Committee expressed by Taylor (2) should not be confused with those of the overwhelming majority of the Enterobacteriaceae Subcommittee of the International Committee on Bacteriological Nomenclature. The two views are diametrically opposed. The International Subcommittee has voted 9 to 4 against conservation of the generic name Bacterium and 10 to 3 against conservation of the family name Bacteriaceae.

In presenting the views of the British subcommittee, Taylor (2) has drawn a parallel between the two actions conserving the generic names Bacillus and Bacterium respectively. In my opinion, the first action conserving the generic name Bacillus was wrong. Consequently, I see no

merit in complicating bacteriological nomenclature still further by conserving another name even more extensively "vulgarized" than the first by the manner in which it has been used and will continue to be used as a general, all-inclusive, lay name.

In summary: I am opposed to conservation of the generic name Bacterium and the family name Bacteriaceae; my reasons are essentially the same as those presented by Borman (1); I cannot agree with the reply of the British subcommittee (2), I point out that action by the International Committee validating Opinion No. 4 would be contrary to the wishes of one of its subcommittees which has already voted against conservation of the names involved.

REFERENCES

- (1) Borman, Earle K. Conservation of the Generic Name Bacterium and the Family Name Bacteriaceae. Int. Bull. of Bact. Nomenclature and Taxonomy. 2(2):60-63. 1952.
- (2) Taylor, Joan. Conservation of the Generic Name Bacterium and the Family Name Bacteriaceae. Comments of the Enterobacteriaceae Subcommittee of the British Advisory Nomenclature Committee. Int. Bull. of Bact. Nomenclature and Taxonomy. 2(3):92-93. 1952
- (3) Judicial Commission of the International Committee on Bacteriological Nomenclature. Opinion No. 4. Status of the Generic Name Bacterium, of the Species Name Bacterium coli and of the Family Name Bacteriaceae. Int. Bull. of Bact. Nomenclature and Taxonomy. 1(4): 145-146. 1952.