Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

LBL Publications

Title

Judicial Opinion 131.

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5wk9z643

Journal

International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology, 75(2)

ISSN

1466-5026

Authors

Arahal, David R Bull, Carolee T Christensen, Henrik et al.

Publication Date

2025-02-27

DOI

10.1099/ijsem.0.006692

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Peer reviewed

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SYSTEMATIC AND EVOLUTIONARY MICROBIOLOGY

ICSP MATTERS

Arahal et al., Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol. 2025;75:006692 DOI 10.1099/ijsem.0.006692





Judicial Opinion 131

David R. Arahal¹, Carolee T. Bull², Henrik Christensen³, Christopher Dunlap⁴, Maria del Carmen Montero-Calasanz⁵, Charles T. Parker⁶, Peter Vandamme⁷, Antonio Ventosa⁸, Stefano Ventura^{9,10}, Peter Young¹¹ and Markus Göker^{12,*}

Abstract

Opinion 131 addresses a Request for an Opinion asking the Judicial Commission to conserve the genus name *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) over its earlier homonym, the protozoan genus name *Proteus* Müller 1786. The Judicial Commission agrees that the later homonym is illegitimate and that the replacement of the prokaryotic name *Proteus* would be undesirable. It is also concluded that *Proteus* Müller 1786 is an objectively invalid name under the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*. Judicial Opinions 9, 12 and 130 serve as precedents for the conservation of *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) over *Proteus* Müller 1786. This action is taken here and makes the prokaryotic name *Proteus* legitimate.

INTRODUCTION

The Request for an Opinion by Li [1] concludes that the genus name *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) [2, 3] is illegitimate because it is a later homonym of *Proteus* Müller 1786, the name of a genus of protozoa. This would also make all validly published names of species and subspecies placed within *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) illegitimate [2–23]. Li [1] considers this undesirable and therefore asks the Judicial Commission to conserve *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) over *Proteus* Müller 1786.

The action of conserving one name over another, even if the latter is the name of a eukaryote, has only recently been reviewed by the Judicial Commission [24, 25]. The present Judicial Opinion can therefore be kept brief and follows the logic of the argumentation set out in the guidelines published by the Commission and in the previous Opinion [24, 25]. In what follows, it will first be clarified whether *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) [2, 3] is illegitimate and what the consequences might be. It will then be considered whether, if it is illegitimate, the name could be made legitimate and, if so, whether the Judicial Commission should take such a step.

IS PROTEUS HAUSER 1885 (APPROVED LISTS 1980) ILLEGITIMATE?

The potential illegitimacy of *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) [2, 3] has already been noted [26, 27]. A comprehensive treatment was given by Becker [26], who recognized the two earlier homonyms:

Proteus Laurenti 1768 (38, p. 35). Type species. *Proteus anguinus* Laurenti 1768. The species described is placed in *Amphibia*. The name is apparently currently accepted and used, as by Noble 1931 (39, p. 483). *Proteus* Mueller 1786 (40, p. 91). Type species. *Proteus diffluens* Mueller 1786. This protozoan generic name was apparently a later homonym of *Proteus* Laurenti 1768.

Like Li [1], Becker [26] realized that *Proteus* Müller 1786 is itself a later homonym of *Proteus* Laurenti 1768. The relevant code for both names is the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature* (ICZN) [28]. In the ICZN, the term 'available name' roughly corresponds to the term 'validly published name' used in the *International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes* (ICNP) [29], while the ICZN terms

Author affiliations: ¹Departamento de Microbiología y Ecología, Universitat de València, Valencia, Spain; ²Department of Plant Pathology and Environmental Microbiology, Pennsylvania State University, 211 Buckhout Lab, University Park, PA 16802, USA; ³Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, University of Copenhagen, 1870 Stigbøjlen 4, Frederiksberg C, Denmark; "Crop Bioprotection Research Unit, USDA/ARS/NCAUR, 1815 N. University St, 61604 Peoria, IL, USA; ⁵IFAPA Las Torres – Andalusian Institute of Agricultural and Fisheries Research and Training, Cra. Sevilla-Cazalla de la Sierra, 41200, Alcalá del Río, Sevilla, Spain; 'Department of Energy, Joint Genome Institute, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA; ⁷Laboratorium voor Microbiologie, Universiteit Gent, K. L. Ledeganckstraat 35, 9000 Gent, Belgium; ⁸Department of Microbiology and Parasitology, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Sevilla, C/. Prof. Garcia Gonzalez 2, ES-41012 Sevilla, Spain; ⁹IRET-CNR, Research Institute on Terrestrial Ecosystems, National Research Council, Via Madonna del Piano 10, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Italy; ¹⁰NBCF, National Biodiversity Future Center, Palermo, Italy; ¹¹Department of Biology, University of York, York Y010 5DD, UK; ¹²Leibniz Institute DSMZ – German Collection of Microorganisms and Cell Cultures, Inhoffenstrasse 7B, D-38124 Braunschweig, Germany.

*Correspondence: Markus Göker, markus.goeker@dsmz.de

Keywords: amphibians; bacteria; medical microbiology; nomenclature; protozoa; taxonomy.

Abbreviations: ICNP, International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes; ICZN, International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. 006692 © 2025 The Authors



'objectively invalid name', 'potentially valid name' and 'valid name' roughly correspond to the ICNP terms 'illegitimate name', 'legitimate name' and 'correct name', respectively. According to Article 52.2 of the ICZN, only the senior homonym can be a valid name; according to Article 60.1, the junior homonym requires a substitute name [28].

As noted by Li [1], Rule 51b(4) of the ICNP is relevant to the legitimacy, or lack thereof, of *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) [2, 3]. It gives as one of the reasons for the illegitimacy of a validly published name:

'If a new name or combination validly published before 31 December 2000 is a later homonym of a name of a taxon of prokaryotes, fungi, algae, protozoa or viruses'.

Unlike Rule 51b(5), this does not require the earlier homonym to have a particular status or recognition under a particular code. However, Rule 51b(4) limits the earlier homonyms of relevance to viruses and certain groups of eukaryotes [30]. For this reason, the presence of the name *Proteus* Laurenti 1768, a potentially valid name under the ICZN, does not render *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) illegitimate, but the presence of *Proteus* Müller 1786 does, although the latter is an objectively invalid name under the ICZN.

COULD PROTEUS HAUSER 1885 (APPROVED LISTS 1980) BE MADE LEGITIMATE?

The power of the Judicial Commission to conserve names over other names is well known [24] and based on Rules 23a and 56b of the ICNP [29]. This extends to the conservation of a prokaryotic name over the name of a eukaryote. Judicial Opinion 130 [25] has reviewed such cases and reiterated that such an action can make an illegitimate name legitimate. Together with Judicial Opinions 9 and 12 [31], Judicial Opinion 130 can also serve as a precedent for the conservation of a prokaryotic name over the name of a eukaryote itself.

SHOULD PROTEUS HAUSER 1885 (APPROVED LISTS 1980) BE MADE LEGITIMATE?

Judicial Opinion 130 [25] states that a name should be conserved over an earlier homonym to overcome the illegitimacy of the later homonym if the Judicial Commission has the power to do so and if the later homonym is 'significantly more important' than the earlier homonym. Since *Proteus* Müller 1786 cannot even be the valid name of an organism whose naming is regulated by the ICZN [1, 26, 28], the Judicial Commission has no doubt that *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) is the significantly more important name [2–23]. Additional reasons why replacing *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) would be undesirable are given by Li [1], including the medical importance of some of the species included in *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980).

With regard to *Proteus* Laurenti 1768, it is not only important that this name has no bearing on the legitimacy of *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980), but it is also noteworthy that Article 52.7 of the ICZN implies that *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) 'is not a homonym for the purposes of zoological nomenclature' [28]. The ICZN does not reciprocate Principle 2 of the ICNP [29].

CONCLUSION

Principle 1 of the ICNP sets out the 'four essential points of nomenclature' [29]. A closer look at these four points reveals that they are in fact opposing forces that need to be balanced against each other in practice [24]. For example, Principle 1(1) and Principle 1(4) can easily conflict, as 'freedom of taxonomic thought or action' often results in names that are intended to replace other names [32]. Principle 1(2) and Principle 1(1), considered in isolation, may also lead to different outcomes, since the rejection of names that 'cause error or confusion' reduces the 'stability of names'.

Of the 'four essential points', the illegitimacy of a later homonym and its possible replacement are based on Principle 1(2) and are mainly implemented by Section 8 of the ICNP [29]. However, the replacement of an illegitimate name, although provided for in Rule 54, is contrary to Principle 1(1). The conservation of an illegitimate name over an earlier homonym under Rules 23a and 56b is instead a way of implementing Principle 1(1). As in other situations, how best to balance the 'four essential points' in the case of *Proteus* must be based on the specifics of the situation.

The negative consequences of the current illegitimacy of *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) [2, 3] are obvious, while those of conserving this name over *Proteus* Müller 1786 are unknown. As long as *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) is illegitimate, this name and the names of the species in this genus are not available for use under the ICNP and would need to be replaced [29]. For this reason, the Judicial Commission decided to conserve *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) over *Proteus* Müller 1786. In the first vote, 11 commissioners agreed that *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980) was illegitimate, none voted against and none abstained. Eleven commissioners then voted in favour of the conservation of the name, none voted against and none abstained. One commissioner did not participate in the ballot. (It was also asked whether the name should be rejected if it was not conserved. Two commissioners agreed, nine voted against and none abstained.) The Judicial Commission wishes to reiterate that conservation can, in principle, be applied to any other case of inconvenient homonymy.

Funding information

Carolee T. Bull's work was supported by the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture Federal Appropriations under project #PEN04926 (accession 7006350), which is gratefully acknowledged. Maria del Carmen Montero-Calasanz is grateful for funding received from the Ramón y Cajal

Research Grant (RYC2019-028468-I) from the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness (MINECO). Stefano Ventura's work was supported by funding from NBFC, Italian National Biodiversity Future Centre (MUR-PNRR, Mission 4.2. Investment 1.4, Project CN00000033), which is gratefully acknowledged.

Acknowledgements

This Opinion was ratified by the voting members of the ICSP, which is gratefully acknowledged.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

References

- Li MS. Request for an Opinion: conservation of the illegitimate prokaryotic generic name *Proteus* Hauser 1885 (Approved Lists 1980). Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2024;74:6434.
- Hauser G. Über Fäulnissbakterien Und Deren Beziehungen Zur Septicämie. Ein Beitrag Zur Morphologie Der Spaltpilze. Leipzig: Vogel; 1885.
- 3. Skerman VBD, McGowan V, Sneath PHA. Approved lists of bacterial names. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* 1980;30:225–420.
- List Editor. Validation of the publication of new names and new combinations previously effectively published outside the IJSB: list No. 10. Int J Syst Bacteriol 1983;33:438–440.
- List Editor. Notification that new names and new combinations have appeared in volume 50, part 5, of the IJSEM. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2000;50:1955.
- Behrendt U, Augustin J, Spröer C, Gelbrecht J, Schumann P, et al. Taxonomic characterisation of Proteus terrae sp. nov., a N20producing, nitrate-ammonifying soil bacterium. Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek 2015;108:1457–1468.
- Behrendt U, Wende S, Kolb S, Ulrich A. Genome-based phylogeny of the genera proteus and cosenzaea and description of Proteus terrae subsp. terrae subsp nov and Proteus terrae subsp Cibarius subsp nov. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2021;71:4651.
- Cosenza BJ, Podgwaite JD. A new species of *Proteus isolated* from larvae of the gypsy moth porthetria dispar (L.). *Antonie Van Leeu-wenhoek* 1966;32:187–191.
- Dai H, Wang Y, Fang Y, Xiao T, Huang Z, et al. Proteus columbae sp. nov., isolated from a pigeon in Ma'anshan, China. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2018;68:552–557.
- Dai H, Wang Y, Fang Y, Huang Z, Kan B, et al. Proteus alimentorum sp. nov., Isolated from pork and lobster in ma'anshan city, china. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2018;68:1390–1395.
- 11. Dai H, Chen A, Wang Y, Lu B, Wang Y, et al. Proteus faecis sp. nov., and Proteus cibi sp. nov., two new species isolated from food and clinical samples in China. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2019;69:852–858.
- Hickman FW, Steigerwalt AG, Farmer JJ, Brenner DJ. Identification of *Proteus penneri* sp. nov., formerly known as Proteus vulgaris indole negative or as *Proteus vulgaris* biogroup 1. *J Clin Microbiol* 1982;15:1097–1102.
- 13. Hyun DW, Jung MJ, Kim MS, Shin NR, Kim PS, et al. Proteus cibarius sp. nov., a swarming bacterium from Jeotgal, a traditional Korean fermented seafood, and emended description of the genus Proteus. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2016;66:2158–2164.
- 14. O'Hara CM, Brenner FW, Steigerwalt AG, Hill BC, Holmes B, et al. Classification of Proteus vulgaris biogroup 3 with recognition of Proteus hauseri sp. nov., nom. rev. and 182 unnamed Proteus genomospecies 4, 5 and 6. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2000;50 Pt 5:1869–1875.
- Oren A, Garrity GM. List of new names and new combinations previously effectively, but not validly, published. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2016;66:1603–1606.

- Oren A, Garrity GM. Notification that new names of prokaryotes, new combinations, and new taxonomic opinions have appeared in volume 66, part 6, of the IJSEM. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2016;66:3765–3767.
- 17. **Oren A, Garrity GM**. Notification that new names of prokaryotes, new combinations, and new taxonomic opinions have appeared in volume 68, part 4, of the IJSEM. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* 2018;68:2134–2136.
- Oren A, Garrity GM. Notification that new names of prokaryotes, new combinations and new taxonomic opinions have appeared in volume 68, part 2, of the IJSEM. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2018;68:1409–1410.
- Oren A, Garrity GM. Notification that new names of prokaryotes, new combinations, and new taxonomic opinions have appeared in volume 69, part 3 of the IJSEM. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2019;69:1529–1530.
- Oren A, Garrity GM. Notification that new names of prokaryotes, new combinations and new taxonomic opinions have appeared in volume 71, part 3 of the IJSEM. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2021;71:4812.
- 21. **Rustigian R, Stuart CA**. Taxonomic relationships in the genus *Proteus. Experimental Biology and Medicine* 1943;53:241–243.
- 22. Shaw C, Clarke PH. Biochemical classification of *Proteus* and providence cultures. *J Gen Microbiol* 1955;13:155–161.
- 23. Yale MW. Genus VI. Proteus HauserProteus hauser. In: Bergey DH, Breed RS, Murray EGD and Hitchens AP (eds). Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteriology, 5th ed. Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Co; 1939. pp. 430–436.
- 24. Arahal DR, Busse H-J, Bull CT, Christensen H, Chuvochina M, et al. Guidelines for interpreting the code and for writing a request for an opinion. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2023;73:5782.
- 25. Arahal DR, Bull CT, Christensen H, Chuvochina M, Dunlap C, et al. Judicial Opinion 130. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2024;74:6414.
- 26. **Becker ER**. The legitimacy of certain generic homonyms in bacteriology and protozoology. *Int Bullet Bacteriol Nomenclat Taxon* 1951;1:103–112.
- 27. **Shipunov A**. The problem of hemihomonyms and the on-line hemihomonyms database (HHDB). *Bionomina* 2011;4:65–72.
- 28. Ride W, Cogger HG, Dupuis C, Kraus O, Minelli A, et al. International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. London: International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature; 1999.
- Oren A, Arahal DR, Göker M, Moore ERB, Rossello-Mora R, et al. International code of nomenclature of prokaryotes. Prokaryotic code (2022 Revision). Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2023;73:5585.
- 30. **Tindall BJ.** Redefining homonyms under rule 51b (4) of the international code of nomenclature of prokaryotes. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* 2016;66:5618–5619.
- 31. **Judicial Commission**. Opinions 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. *Int Bullet Bacteriol Nomenclat Taxon* 1954:4:141–158.
- 32. Arahal DR, Busse H-J, Bull CT, Christensen H, Chuvochina M, et al. Judicial Opinions 112-122. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 2022;72:5481.