Taxonomic Note

Correspondence

J. M. Young
youngji@landcareresearch.co.nz

Proposed revision of Rule 33c to perpetuate the citation of revived names

J. M. Young¹ and J. P. Euzéby²

¹Landcare Research, Private Bag 92170, Auckland, New Zealand

²Société de Bactériologie Systématique et Vétérinaire (SBSV) et École Nationale Vétérinaire de Toulouse (ENVT), BP 87614, 31076 Toulouse Cedex 3, France

All names published prior to 1980 that were not included in the Approved Lists are available for reuse without reference to their past application. However, the International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria endorses the revival of disused names in the sense in which they were previously used and provides Rules (28a, 33c and 33d) as guidance. Nevertheless, the Code is obscure as to how citations are to be reported for this use to be perpetuated in subsequent nomenclatural revisions. A revision of Rule 33c is proposed.

The International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria (1990 Revision) (Lapage *et al.*, 1992–hereafter called ‘the Code’) makes it clear that all names published prior to 1980 but not included in the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names (Skerman *et al.*, 1980) have no further standing in nomenclature and are available for reuse to name any new taxon, regardless of the previous application of the name (Rule 24a). Unless otherwise indicated, a proposal using such a name is assumed to be of a new taxon, not necessarily related to that published in the past. However, the Code specifically allows the revival of species names applied in their previous sense (Rule 28a) and gives rules for their citation (Rules 33c and 33d). The application of these rules is somewhat obscure and the following proposed revision of the Code has the intention of clarifying them.

Rule 28 states that where authors wish to revive a disused name, they may make their intention clear by appending the abbreviation ‘nom. rev.’ (revived name) to the name and refer to the original author citation. Palleroni & Holmes (1981) revived *Pseudomonas cepacia* Burkholder 1950 in this way. However, subsequent citation of the correct name is based the record of valid publication (Rule 27), in this case *Pseudomonas cepacia* Palleroni & Holmes 1981. Therefore reference to the name with its particular application, as applied in the past by Burkholder (1950), is lost. Rule 33c provides for continuity of nomenclature by allowing inclusion of the original authors in the citation in subsequent reports preceded by ‘ex’, e.g. *Pseudomonas cepacia* (ex Burkholder 1950) Palleroni & Holmes 1981. However, subsequent revisions, reporting only the citation of the valid publication would take the form *Burkholderia cepacia* (Palleroni & Holmes, 1981) Yabuuchi *et al.* 1993, and the fact that the name was revived, as intended in Rule 28a, would also be lost. A solution would be to record subsequent citations in the form *Burkholderia cepacia*

(Palleroni & Holmes 1981 ex Burkholder 1950) Yabuuchi *et al.* 1993.

Rule 33c

It is proposed that Rule 33c be revised to specify citation in this way by changing the example from *Bacillus palustris* sp. nov., nom. rev. to *Pseudomonas cepacia* sp. nov., nom. rev., and amending Note 2 to read:

Note 2. If authors wish to indicate the names of the original authors of a revived name, they may do so by citation of the name of the taxon, followed by the word ‘ex’ and the names of the original authors and the year of publication, in parentheses, followed by the abbreviation ‘nom. rev.’.

Example: *Pseudomonas cepacia* (Burkholder 1950) sp. nov., nom. rev., proposed by Palleroni & Holmes 1981. An author who subsequently referred to this revived name should use the citation *Pseudomonas cepacia* (ex Burkholder 1950) Palleroni & Holmes 1981. If the name is subsequently revised, its origins should be perpetuated by the inclusion of the original citation in the form *Burkholderia cepacia* (Palleroni & Holmes 1981 ex Burkholder 1950) Yabuuchi *et al.* 1993.

Where a name has clearly been proposed as a revived name, but the authors did not use this formulation, it may subsequently be introduced by following authors.

References

- Burkholder, W. H. (1950). Sour skin, a bacterial rot of onion bulbs. *Phytopathology* **40**, 115–117.
- 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.

Palleroni, N. J. & Holmes, B. (1981). *Pseudomonas cepacia* sp. nov., nom. rev. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **31**, 479–481.

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

Yabuuchi, E., Kosako, Y., Oyaizu, H., Yano, I., Hotta, H., Hashimoto, Y., Ezaki, T. & Arakawa, M. (1992). Proposal of *Burkholderia* gen. nov. and transfer of seven species of the genus *Pseudomonas* homology group II to the new genus, with the type species *Burkholderia cepacia* (Palleroni & Holmes 1981) comb. nov. *Microbiol Immunol* **36**, 1251–1275.