A taxonomic note on the authorship and date of valid publication of **Rhodococcus sputi**
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Authorship of the name **Rhodococcus sputi** is variously attributed to Tsukamura 1978 or Tsukamura and Yano 1985. DNA–DNA binding data indicate that this species and **Rhodococcus obuensis** Tsukamura 1983 and **Rhodococcus chubuensis** Tsukamura 1983 are subjective (heterotypic) synonyms. Although these organisms have been placed in the genus *Gordonia* as *Gordonia sputi*, the correct name of the taxon created by unification of these three species is directly affected by the date of valid publication of these species as members of the genus *Rhodococcus*. Thus, the name *R. sputi* only has priority if the authorship is attributed to Tsukamura 1978. The question of authorship and priority is clarified in the present work.
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The Approved Lists of Bacterial Names (Skerman *et al.*, 1980) did not include the name *Rhodococcus sputi* Tsukamura 1978, which was published by Tsukamura (1978), nor was it included in the corrected version (Skerman *et al.*, 1989). In view of the fact that the name was not included in the Approved Lists, Tsukamura & Yano (1985) revived the name *Rhodococcus sputi*, together with the name *Rhodococcus aurantiacus*. Various taxonomic changes have now meant that *R. sputi* is now included in the genus *Gordonia* (see Stackebrandt *et al.*, 1988, 1989). In addition, it has been shown that the species *R. sputi* (*Gordonia sputi*) has a sufficiently high DNA–DNA binding value to be considered to be in the same taxon as *Rhodococcus obuensis* Tsukamura 1983 (see Tsukamura, 1982, 1983; Zakrzewska-Czerwińska *et al.*, 1988). Riegel *et al.* (1994) have also provided evidence that *Rhodococcus chubuensis* Tsukamura 1983 (Tsukamura, 1982, 1983) is also a member of the species *G. sputi*. However, a number of problems arise in connection with the name *R. sputi*, the basionym of *G. sputi*, which have a direct bearing on the priority of the three different synonyms, *R. chubuensis*, *R. obuensis* and *R. sputi*. The name *R. sputi* appears twice in various publications, either as *R. sputi* Tsukamura 1978 or as *R. sputi* (ex Tsukamura) Tsukamura and Yano 1985.

The Bacteriological Code (1975 Revision) (Lapage *et al.*, 1992) states that ‘names validly published under this Code between 1 January 1978 and 1 January 1980 will be added to the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names’ (Rule 24a, Note 1) and the Bacteriological Code (1990 Revision) (Lapage *et al.*, 1992) states that ‘these Approved Lists of Bacterial Names were approved by the ICSB and published in the IJSB on 1 January 1980. Names validly published between 1 January 1978 and 1 January 1980 were included in the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names’ (Rule 24a, Note 1). Thus, the name *R. sputi* Tsukamura 1978 may be considered to have been placed in the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names (Skerman *et al.*, 1980), although the name was not included in the corrected version published in 1989 (Skerman *et al.*, 1989). It is interesting to note that, in the lists of nomenclatural changes in the period 1 January 1980 to 1 January 1985 published in Moore *et al.* (1985), the name *R. sputi* Tsukamura 1978 is cited correctly. However, in view of the fact that the name *R. sputi* Tsukamura 1978 was not included in the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names (Skerman *et al.*, 1980), Tsukamura & Yano (1985) revived the name *R. sputi* (ex Tsukamura) Tsukamura and Yano 1985. It should be noted that the name *R. sputi* (ex Tsukamura) Tsukamura and Yano 1985 appears in two subsequent publications by Moore & Moore (1989, 1992), but that the name *R. sputi* Tsukamura 1978 is absent from these lists.

To clarify the situation, it should be noted that the name *R. sputi* Tsukamura 1978 is to be treated as being included in the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names and that the name has priority over *R. sputi* (ex Tsukamura 1978) Tsukamura and Yano 1985. However, it should also be noted that the name *R. sputi* (ex Tsukamura 1978) Tsukamura and Yano 1985 is illegitimate ac-
cording to Rules 51a and 51b of the Bacteriological Code (1990 Revision) (Lapage et al., 1992). The name is contrary to Rule 33c, since the name R. sputi Tsukamura 1978 is treated as being in the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names and therefore cannot be revived, and is illegitimate, as defined by Rule 51a. Similarly, the name R. sputi (ex Tsukamura 1978) Tsukamura and Yano 1985 is also contrary to Rule 51b, since the authors should have used the name R. sputi Tsukamura 1978. It is hoped that clarification of the status of the names R. sputi Tsukamura 1978 and R. sputi (ex Tsukamura 1978) Tsukamura and Yano 1985 will lead to the appropriate corrections in the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names and in those databases that have taken on the mammoth task of keeping track of nomenclatural changes governed by the Bacteriological Code.
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