

Current text	Proposed new text	Comments	References
<p>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.</p> <p>Example: <i>Campylobacter pylori</i> subsp. <i>mustelae</i> Fox <i>et al.</i> 1988 becomes <i>Campylobacter mustelae</i> (Fox <i>et al.</i> 1988) Fox <i>et al.</i> 1989.</p>	<p>Rule 50a If a subspecies is elevated in rank to a species, the subspecific epithet in the name of the subspecies must become the specific epithet of the name of the species unless the resulting combination is illegitimate.</p> <p>Example: <i>Campylobacter pylori</i> subsp. <i>mustelae</i> Fox <i>et al.</i> 1988 becomes <i>Campylobacter mustelae</i> (Fox <i>et al.</i> 1988) Fox <i>et al.</i> 1989.</p> <p>Note. Based on Rule 34a, elevation of a subspecies to the rank of species does not create a new combination. New combination events are applicable only at the identical rank.</p>	<p>Text clarifications prepared by the Editorial Board</p> <p>Addition proposed by Oren and Garrity, 2018.</p>	<p>Oren A, Garrity GM. Proposal to emend Rules 50a and 50b of the International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes <i>Int J Syst Evol Microbiol</i> 2018;68:3371-3376.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Example: <i>Bifidobacterium globosum</i> (ex Scardovi <i>et al.</i> 1969) Biavati <i>et al.</i> 1982 becomes <i>Bifidobacterium pseudolongum</i></p>	<p>Rule 50b If 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.</p> <p>Example: <i>Bifidobacterium globosum</i> (ex Scardovi <i>et al.</i> 1969) Biavati <i>et al.</i> 1982 becomes <i>Bifidobacterium pseudolongum</i></p>		

subsp. <i>globosum</i> (Biavati <i>et al.</i> 1982) Yaeshima <i>et al.</i> 1992.	subsp. <i>globosum</i> (Biavati <i>et al.</i> 1982) Yaeshima <i>et al.</i> 1992. Note. Based on Rule 34a, lowering a species to the rank of subspecies does not create a new combination. New combination events are applicable only at the identical rank.	Addition proposed by Oren and Garrity, 2018.	Oren A, Garrity GM. Proposal to emend Rules 50a and 50b of the International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes <i>Int J Syst Evol Microbiol</i> 2018;68:3371-3376.
Section 8. Illegitimate Names and Epithets: Replacement, Rejection, and Conservation of Names and Epithets	Section 8. Illegitimate Names and Epithets: Replacement, Rejection, and Conservation of Names and Epithets		
Illegitimate Names	Illegitimate Names		
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 <i>Diplococcus</i> Weichselbaum 1886 is combined with the genus <i>Streptococcus</i> Rosenbach 1884, <i>Diplococcus</i> is illegitimate as the name of the combined genus because it is not the earlier name. If the genus <i>Diplococcus</i> Weichselbaum is accepted as separate and distinct, then the name <i>Diplococcus</i> is legitimate.	Rule 51a A name contrary to a Rule is illegitimate and may not be used. However, a name of a taxon that 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 <i>Diplococcus</i> Weichselbaum 1886 is combined with the genus <i>Streptococcus</i> Rosenbach 1884, <i>Diplococcus</i> is illegitimate as the name of the combined genus because it is not the earlier name. If the genus <i>Diplococcus</i> Weichselbaum 1886 is accepted as separate and distinct, then the name <i>Diplococcus</i> is legitimate.		
Rule 51b	Rule 51b		

<p>Among the reasons for which a name may be illegitimate are the following.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>Example: If an author circumscribes a genus to include <i>Bacillus subtilis</i>, the type species of the genus <i>Bacillus</i>, then the circumscribed genus must be named <i>Bacillus</i>.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>Example: The name <i>Bacillus whitmori</i> Bergey et al. 1930 was illegitimate as Whitmore had named the organism <i>Bacillus pseudomallei</i> in 1913 [31].</p> <p>(3) If its specific epithet must be rejected under Rules 52 or 53.</p>	<p>Among the reasons for which a name may be illegitimate are the following:</p> <p>(1) If the taxon to which the name was applied, as circumscribed by the author (s), included the nomenclatural type of a name that the author (s) ought to have adopted under one or more of the Rules.</p> <p>Example: If an author circumscribes a genus to include <i>Bacillus subtilis</i>, the type species of the genus <i>Bacillus</i>, then the circumscribed genus must be named <i>Bacillus</i>.</p> <p>(2) If the author (s) 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.</p> <p>Example: The name <i>Bacillus whitmori</i> Bergey et al. 1930 is illegitimate as Whitmore had named the organism <i>Bacillus pseudomallei</i> in 1913 [31].</p> <p>(3) If the specific epithet must be rejected under Rules 52 or 53.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>(4) If it is a later homonym of a name of a taxon of prokaryotes, fungi, algae, protozoa, or viruses.</p> <p>Example: <i>Phytomonas</i> Donovan 1909, a genus of flagellates, antedates <i>Phytomonas</i> Bergey et al. 1923, a genus of prokaryote (Opinion 14; Judicial Commission [32]).</p> <p>Names of prokaryotes validly published under this revision of the Code are not to be rejected as homonyms of names of prokaryotes published before 1980 and omitted from the Approved Lists.</p>	<p>(4) 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.</p> <p>Example: <i>Phytomonas</i> Donovan 1909, a genus of flagellates, antedates <i>Phytomonas</i> Bergey et al. 1923, a genus of prokaryote (Opinion 14; Judicial Commission [32]).</p> <p>(5) If a new name or combination validly published on or after 1 January 2001 is a later homonym of a validly published name of a taxon of prokaryotes or a name or combination validly published or available under the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants or the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. This does not affect validly published names or combinations not treated as later homonyms prior to 1 January 2001.</p>	<p>Changes proposed by Tindall, 2016. 'If' was added</p>	<p>Tindall BJ. Redefining homonyms under Rule 51b (4) of the International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes. <i>Int J Syst Evol Microbiol</i> 2016;66:5618-5619.</p>
<p>Illegitimate Epithets</p>	<p>Illegitimate Epithets</p>		
<p>Rule 52 The following are not to be regarded as specific or subspecific epithets:</p> <p>(1) A word or phrase which is not intended as a specific epithet.</p>	<p>Rule 52 The following are not to be regarded as specific or subspecific epithets:</p> <p>(1) A word or phrase that is not intended as a specific epithet.</p>		

<p>Example: <i>Bacillus nova species</i> Matzuschita.</p> <p>(2) A word which is an ordinal adjective higher than ten used for enumeration.</p> <p>Example: <i>undecimus, duodecimus</i> etc.</p> <p>(3) A number or letter. Example: <i>α</i> in <i>Bacillus α</i> von Freudenreich.</p>	<p>Example: <i>Bacillus nova species</i> Matzuschita.</p> <p>(2) A word that is an ordinal adjective higher than ten used for enumeration.</p> <p>Example: <i>undecimus, duodecimus</i> etc.</p> <p>(3) A number or letter. Example: <i>α</i> in <i>Bacillus α</i> von Freudenreich.</p>		
<p>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.</p> <p>Example: <i>Bacillus pallidus</i> Scholz <i>et al.</i> 1988 is based on the nomenclatural type, strain H12; the specific epithet <i>pallidus</i> cannot be used for <i>Bacillus pallidus</i> Zhou <i>et al.</i> 2008, which is a different bacterium whose name is based upon another type.</p>	<p>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 is a different bacterium with a name based upon another type.</p> <p>Example: <i>Bacillus pallidus</i> Scholz <i>et al.</i> 1988 is based on the nomenclatural type, strain H12; the specific epithet <i>pallidus</i> cannot be used for <i>Bacillus pallidus</i> Zhou <i>et al.</i> 2008, which is a different bacterium with a name based upon another type.</p>		
<p>Replacement of Names</p>			
<p>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</p>	<p>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 that in the</p>	<p>(as commented for Principle 6): In 2008, Tindall proposed deleting the concepts of legitimate and illegitimate names from the ICNP. The Editorial Board understands that</p>	<p>Tindall BJ. Are the concepts of legitimate and illegitimate names necessary under the</p>

<p>the new position will be in accordance with the Rules.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Example: <i>Pfeifferella pseudomallei</i> (Whitmore 1913) Ford 1928 is an illegitimate combination since <i>Pfeifferella</i> is a homonym of a protozoan generic name (Opinion 14; Judicial Commission [32]). The epithet <i>pseudomallei</i> can be used for this organism in another genus, <i>Pseudomonas pseudomallei</i> (Whitmore 1913) Haynes 1957.</p>	<p>new position will be in accordance with the Rules.</p> <p>If no legitimate name or epithet exists, one must be designated. A specific epithet is not rendered illegitimate by publication of a species name in which the generic name is illegitimate (Rule 32b). An author may use such an epithet, 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(s) of the combination. However, the epithet is ascribed to the original author(s).</p> <p>Example: <i>Pfeifferella pseudomallei</i> (Whitmore 1913) Ford 1928 is an illegitimate combination since <i>Pfeifferella</i> is a homonym of a protozoan generic name (Opinion 14; Judicial Commission [32]). The epithet <i>pseudomallei</i> can be used for this organism in another genus, <i>Pseudomonas pseudomallei</i> (Whitmore 1913) Haynes 1957</p>	<p>this proposal was withdrawn by the author in 2018, but has no formal record of this. No change was made in the text based on the Tindall 2008 proposal.</p>	<p>current International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria? A proposal to make changes to the Code. <i>Int J Syst Evol Microbiol</i> 2008;58,1979–1986.</p>
<p>Rule 55 A legitimate name or epithet may not be replaced merely because of the following.</p> <p>(1) It is inappropriate.</p>	<p>Rule 55 A validly published name or epithet may not be replaced merely because of the following:</p> <p>(1) It is inappropriate.</p>		

<p>Example: <i>Bacteroides melaninogenicus</i> does not produce melanin (see Schwabacher et al. [33]).</p> <p>(2) It is disagreeable.</p> <p>Example: <i>Miyagawanella lymphogranulomatis</i>.</p> <p>(3) Another name is preferable.</p> <p>Example: Not yet found.</p> <p>(4) Another name is better known.</p> <p>Example: <i>Corynebacterium pseudodiphtheriticum</i> cannot be rejected because the synonym <i>Corynebacterium hofmannii</i> is better known.</p> <p>(5) It no longer describes the organism.</p> <p>Example: <i>Haemophilus influenzae</i> (does not cause influenza).</p> <p>(6) It has been cited incorrectly; an incorrect citation can be rectified by a later author.</p> <p>Example: <i>Proteus morganii</i> Yale 1939 (see Lessel [34]).</p>	<p>Example: <i>Bacteroides melaninogenicus</i> does not produce melanin (see Schwabacher et al. [33]).</p> <p>(2) It is disagreeable.</p> <p>Example: <i>Miyagawanella lymphogranulomatis</i>.</p> <p>(3) Another name is preferable.</p> <p>Example: Not yet found.</p> <p>(4) Another name is better known.</p> <p>Example: <i>Corynebacterium pseudodiphtheriticum</i> cannot be rejected because the synonym <i>Corynebacterium hofmannii</i> is better known.</p> <p>(5) It no longer describes the organism.</p> <p>Example: <i>Haemophilus influenzae</i> (does not cause influenza).</p> <p>(6) It has been cited incorrectly; an incorrect citation can be rectified by a later author.</p> <p>Example: <i>Proteus morganii</i> Yale 1939 (see Lessel [34]).</p>	<p>The Editorial Board do not see what is disagreeable here. Moreover, the genus name in the example was not included in the Approved Lists. Therefore, this can be deleted.</p> <p>This example from 'ancient history' can be deleted.</p> <p>An old example that predates the Approved Lists and is no longer relevant.</p>	<p>Commented [IS1]: Or replace with "and appears to be a synonym of <i>Mycobacterium bovis</i>"</p>
---	---	---	--

		It may be possible to simplify and shorten Rule 55, e.g., as follows: A validly published name or epithet may not be replaced merely because it is inappropriate (Example: <i>Bacteroides melaninogenicus</i> does not produce melanin), it is disagreeable, another name is preferable or better known, or it no longer describes the organism (Example: <i>Haemophilus influenzae</i> that does not cause influenza).	
Rejection of Names	Rejection of Names		
<p>Rule 56a Only the Judicial Commission can place names on the list of rejected names (<i>nomina rejicienda</i>) (see Rule 23a, Note 4, and Appendix 4). A name may be placed on this list for various reasons, including the following:</p> <p>(1) An ambiguous name (<i>nomen ambiguum</i>), i.e. a name which has been used with different meanings and thus has become a source of error.</p> <p>Example: <i>Aerobacter</i> Beijerinck 1900 (Opinion 46; Judicial Commission [35]).</p> <p>(2) A doubtful name (<i>nomen dubium</i>), i.e. a name whose application is uncertain.</p>	<p>Rule 56a Only the Judicial Commission can place names on the list of rejected names (<i>nomina rejicienda</i>) (see Rule 23a, Note 4, and Appendix 4). A name may be placed on this list for various reasons, including the following:</p> <p>(1) An ambiguous name (<i>nomen ambiguum</i>), i.e. a name which has been used with different meanings and thus has become a source of error.</p> <p>Example: <i>Aerobacter</i> Beijerinck 1900 (Opinion 46; Judicial Commission [35]).</p> <p>(2) A doubtful name (<i>nomen dubium</i>), i.e. a name whose application is uncertain.</p>		

<p>Example: <i>Leuconostoc citrovoium</i> (Opinion 45; Judicial Commission [36]).</p> <p>(3) A name causing confusion (<i>nomen confusum</i>), i.e. a name based upon a mixed culture.</p> <p>Example: <i>Malleomyces</i> Hallier 1870.</p> <p>(4) A perplexing name (<i>nomen perplexum</i>), a name whose application is known but which causes uncertainty in bacteriology (see Rule 57c).</p> <p>Example: <i>Bacillus limnophilus</i> Bredemann and Stürck in Stürck 1935 (Greek–Greek, marsh loving) and <i>Bacillus limophilus</i> Migula 1900 (Latin–Greek, mud loving); see <i>Index Bergeyana</i>, p. 196 [37].</p> <p>(5) A perilous name (<i>nomen periculosum</i>), i.e. a name whose application is likely to lead to accidents endangering health or life or both or of serious economic consequences.</p> <p>Example: <i>Yersinia pseudotuberculosis</i> subsp. <i>pestis</i> (Opinion 60; Judicial</p>	<p>Example: <i>Leuconostoc citrovorum</i> (Opinion 45; Judicial Commission [36]).</p> <p>(3) A name causing confusion (<i>nomen confusum</i>), i.e. a name based upon a mixed culture.</p> <p>Example: <i>Malleomyces</i> Hallier 1870.</p> <p>(4) A perplexing name (<i>nomen perplexum</i>), a name that the application is known but causes uncertainty in prokaryotic nomenclature (see Rule 57c).</p> <p>Example: <i>Bacillus limnophilus</i> Bredemann and Stürck in Stürck 1935 (Greek–Greek, marsh loving) and <i>Bacillus limophilus</i> Migula 1900 (Latin–Greek, mud loving); see <i>Index Bergeyana</i>, p. 196 [37].</p> <p>(5) A perilous name (<i>nomen periculosum</i>), i.e. a name that the application is likely to lead to accidents endangering health or life or of serious economic consequences.</p> <p>Example: <i>Yersinia pseudotuberculosis</i> subsp. <i>pestis</i> (Opinion 60; Judicial</p>	<p>A curious case. The name is found in LPSN as [Malleomyces] but it is not in the 1980 Approved Lists. Example to be deleted?</p> <p>‘that the’ was proposed instead of ‘whose’ by one of the members of the Editorial Board. Is this correct? Is ‘for which the’ better?</p> <p>This example is ‘ancient history’, pre-1980, and the names are not on the Approved Lists. Are such examples still needed here?</p> <p>‘that the’ was proposed instead of ‘whose’ by one of the members of the Editorial Board. Is this correct? Is ‘for which the’ better?</p>	
---	---	--	--

<p>Commission [38]) is to be rejected as a nomen periculosum.</p> <p><i>Note 1.</i> This application is restricted to a proposed change in the specific epithet of a nomenspecies which is widely recognized as contagious, virulent, or highly toxigenic, for example, to that of a subspecies of a species having a different host range or a degree of contagiousness or virulence. If the Judicial Commission recognizes a high order of risk to health, or of serious economic consequences, an Opinion may be issued that the taxon be maintained as a separate nomenspecies, without prejudice to the recognition or acceptance of its genetic relatedness to another taxon.</p>	<p>Commission [38]) is to be rejected as a nomen periculosum.</p> <p><i>Note 1.</i> This application is restricted to a proposed change in the specific epithet of a species that is widely recognized as contagious, virulent, or highly toxigenic, for example, to that of a subspecies of a species having a different host range or a degree of contagiousness or virulence. If the Judicial Commission recognizes a high order of risk to health, or of serious economic consequences, an Opinion may be issued that the taxon be maintained as a separate species, without prejudice to the recognition or acceptance of its genetic relatedness to another taxon.</p>	<p>The term ‘nomenspecies’ is nowhere defined in the Code; it is only found in the report from the 13th int. Congress for Microbiology, Boston, 1982, as found in Appendix 13.</p>	
<p>Conservation of Names</p>	<p>Conservation of Names</p>		
<p>Rule 56b A conserved name (<i>nomen conservandum</i>) is a name which must be used instead of all earlier synonyms and homonyms.</p> <p><i>Note 1.</i> A conserved name (<i>nomen conservandum</i>) 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</p>	<p>Rule 56b A conserved name (<i>nomen conservandum</i>) is a name that must be used instead of all earlier synonyms and homonyms.</p> <p><i>Note 1.</i> A conserved name (<i>nomen conservandum</i>) 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</p>		

<p>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 and 23b.</p> <p><i>Note 2.</i> Only the Judicial Commission can place names on the list of conserved names (<i>nomina conservanda</i>) (see also Rule 23a, Note 4, and Appendix 4).</p>	<p>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 and 23b.</p> <p><i>Note 2.</i> Only the Judicial Commission can place names on the list of conserved names (<i>nomina conservanda</i>) (see also Rule 23a, Note 4, and Appendix 4).</p>		
Section 9. Orthography	Section 9. Orthography		
<p>Rule 57a Any name or epithet should be written in conformity with the spelling of the word from which it is derived and in strict accordance with the rules of Latin and latinization. Exceptions are provided for typographic and orthographic errors in Rule 61 and orthographic variants in Rules 62a and 62b (see also Appendix 9).</p>	<p>Rule 57a Any name or epithet should be written in conformity with the spelling of the word from which it is derived and in strict accordance with the rules of Latin and latinization. Exceptions are provided for typographic and orthographic errors in Rule 61 and orthographic variants in Rules 62a and 62b (see also Appendix 9).</p>	Appendix 9 does not mention orthographic variants.	
<p>Rule 57b In this Code, orthographic variant means a name (or epithet) which differs from another name only in transliteration into Latin of the same word from a language other than Latin or in its grammatical correctness.</p> <p>Example: <i>Haemophilus</i>, <i>Hemophilus</i>.</p>	<p>Rule 57b In this Code, orthographic variant means a name (or epithet) that differs from another name only in transliteration into Latin of the same word from a language other than Latin or in its grammatical correctness.</p> <p>Example: <i>Haemophilus</i>, <i>Hemophilus</i>.</p>		
Rule 57c	Rule 57c		

<p>When two or more generic names or two or more epithets in the same genus are so similar (although the words are from different sources) as to cause uncertainty they may be treated as perplexing names (<i>nomina perplexa</i>) and the matter referred to the Judicial Commission [see Rule 56a(4)].</p> <p>Example: <i>Bacillus limnophilus</i> and <i>Bacillus limophilus</i> [see Rule 56a(4)].</p> <p>Note 1. Orthographic variants may be corrected by any author.</p> <p>Note 2. Perplexing names may be placed on the list of rejected names only by the Judicial Commission, because decisions on the status of names derived from different sources differing in one or more letters affect many well-known names in bacteriology.</p> <p>Examples: <i>Salmonella gamaba</i> and <i>Salmonella gambaga</i>.</p>	<p>If two or more generic names or two or more epithets in the same genus are so similar (although the words are from different sources) as to cause uncertainty, they may be treated as perplexing names (<i>nomina perplexa</i>) and the matter referred to the Judicial Commission [see Rule 56a(4)].</p> <p>Example: <i>Bacillus limnophilus</i> and <i>Bacillus limophilus</i> [see Rule 56a(4)].</p> <p>Note 1. Orthographic variants may be corrected by any author.</p> <p>Note 2. Perplexing names may be placed on the list of rejected names only by the Judicial Commission, because decisions on the status of names derived from different sources differing in one or more letters affect many well-known names in the nomenclature of prokaryotes.</p> <p>Examples: <i>Salmonella gamaba</i> and <i>Salmonella gambaga</i>.</p>	<p>This example is ‘ancient history’, pre-1980, and the names are not on the Approved Lists. The Editorial Board suggest deleting the example.</p> <p>These names are ‘ancient history’ – they are in the Index Bergeyana but not in the 1980 Approved Lists</p>	
<p>Rule 58 When there is doubt about different spellings of the same name or epithet, or where two spellings are sufficiently alike to be confused, the question should be referred to the Judicial Commission, which may issue an Opinion as seems fit.</p>	<p>Rule 58 If doubt exists about different spellings of the same name or epithet, or if two spellings are sufficiently alike so as to be confused, the question should be referred to the Judicial Commission, which may issue an Opinion. If one of the</p>		

<p>If one of the spellings is preferred by the Judicial Commission, this spelling should be used by succeeding authors.</p> <p>Example: The epithet “<i>megaterium</i>” (over “<i>megatherium</i>”) in the species name <i>Bacillus megaterium</i> de Bary 1884 (Opinion 1; Judicial Commission [39]).</p>	<p>spellings is preferred by the Judicial Commission, that spelling should be used by succeeding authors.</p> <p>Example: The epithet “<i>megaterium</i>” (over “<i>megatherium</i>”) in the species name <i>Bacillus megaterium</i> de Bary 1884 (Opinion 1; Judicial Commission [39]).</p>		
<p>Rule 59 An epithet, even one derived from the name of a person, should not be written with an initial capital letter.</p> <p>Example: <i>Shigella flexneri</i> (named after Flexner).</p>	<p>Rule 59 An epithet, even one derived from the name of a person, should not be written with an initial capital letter.</p> <p>Example: <i>Shigella flexneri</i> (named after Flexner).</p>		