Nigerian Journal of Arts and Humanities (NJAH), Volume 3 Number 2, 2023 (ISSN: 2814-3760, E-ISSN: 2955-0343)
Indexed in Google Scholar (Email: njahjournal@gmail.com) Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

LINGUISTIC MORPHOLOGY OF MICROBIAL TAXONOMY (NAMES OF MICROORGANISMS)

Jeremiah Anene Nwankwegu[1]; Rita Ogodo Nwankwegu[2]

1. jeremiah.nwankwegu@ebsu.edu.ng Department of Languages and Linguistics, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki
2. rita.nwankwegu@ebsu.edu.ng Department of Food Science and Technology, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki

Abstract

This study explores the intersection of linguistics, microbiology, and food science by investigating the morphological structures and naming strategies employed in microbial taxonomy. Using a purposive sample of fifty microorganism names, the paper conducts a linguistic morphological analysis to identify their constituent morphemes and the processes involved in their formation. The microbial names are grouped into three main categories based on their impact on food: Beneficial Microorganisms (used in food production and fermentation), Spoilage Microorganisms (responsible for food spoilage), and Pathogenic Microorganisms (associated with foodborne illnesses). An additional category, *Other Food-Related Microorganisms*, includes those with neutral or context-dependent roles. The analysis reveals an interesting intersection of morphological techniques, including eponymy, compounding, loanwords and borrowing (primarily from Latin and Greek), loan-blending, alphanumeric blending, clipping, incorporation, and instances of folk etymology. These naming strategies reflect the interdisciplinary nature of scientific nomenclature, where anatomical, historical, functional, and cultural references converge to form taxonomic identities. By situating microbial naming conventions within broader linguistic frameworks, the paper highlights their communicative utility in scientific classification, food safety, documentation, and pedagogy. Ultimately, the study contributes to a more integrated understanding of how language structures scientific thought and categorization, particularly within the context of food-related microbiology.

Introduction

Microbial taxonomy—the system by which microorganisms are named and classified—has long been governed by conventions rooted in classical languages, scientific tradition, and functional description. However, beyond their taxonomic function, the names of microorganisms are rich linguistic artifacts that merit scholarly attention from a morphological perspective. While microbiologists may focus on the biological features that inspire nomenclature, linguists are well-positioned to interrogate the structural composition and formative strategies of these names.

This paper presents a linguistic morphological analysis of microbial nomenclature, with a view to identifying the constituent morphemes and the morphological processes by which such names are formed. It takes as its data fifty scientifically recognized microorganism names spanning viruses, bacteria, fungi, and protozoa, many of which are relevant in food science, public health, and medical microbiology. The study classifies the morphological strategies employed in these names, such as eponymy (naming after persons), compounding (joining of morphemes), loaning and borrowing (especially from Latin and Greek), loan-blending (combining native and foreign forms), clipping, alphanumeric blending, incorporation, and even folk etymology.

This interdisciplinary inquiry lies at the confluence of linguistics, food science, and microbiology. It aims not only to demonstrate the morphological richness of microbial nomenclature but also to reinforce the relevance of language analysis in scientific disciplines. The findings underscore how naming in science is a deeply linguistic act that blends history, function, and form—often with remarkable precision and creativity. Ultimately, the paper advocates for greater attention to language as a system of meaning-making within the scientific enterprise.

2.0 Literature Review

The nomenclature of microorganisms is governed by a complex interplay of linguistic, historical, and scientific factors. This review examines the morphological processes and naming strategies employed in microbial taxonomy, drawing from linguistics, microbiology, and food science.

2.1. Historical and Linguistic Foundations of Microbial Nomenclature

The binomial system of nomenclature introduced by Carl Linnaeus in the 18th century remains foundational in microbial taxonomy (Linnaeus, 1753). In this system, each organism is assigned a genus and species name, typically derived from Latin or Greek, and intended to reflect either phenotypic characteristics, geographic origin, or honor a discoverer. For example, *Escherichia coli* is named after the pediatrician Theodor Escherich, while *Staphylococcus aureus* draws from Greek “staphyle” (grape) and Latin “aureus” (golden), describing the organism’s cluster formation and pigmentation (Madigan et al., 2018).

2.2. Morphological Processes in Naming Microorganisms

Microbial names are rich linguistic constructions formed through various morphological strategies:

- **Eponymy**: Seen in names like *Listeria monocytogenes* and *Salmonella enterica*, which honor Joseph Lister and Daniel E. Salmon, respectively (Ryan & Ray, 2004).
- **Compounding**: As in *Bacillus cereus* ("waxy rod"), combines Latin descriptors of form and texture (Tortora, Funke & Case, 2016).
- **Loaning/Borrowing**: Most names incorporate classical languages, e.g., *Vibrio cholerae*, where "vibrio" is from Latin *vibrare* (to move or vibrate) (Sneath, 1986).
- **Loan-Blending**: Combining borrowed roots and modern descriptors, such as *Pseudomonas* (false unit) or *Enterococcus* (intestinal coccus) (Singleton, 2004).
- **Clipping**: Less common in formal taxonomy, but colloquial expressions like *E. coli* are clippings of *Escherichia coli* (Black, 2008).
- **Alphanumeric Blending**: As in *E. coli O157:H7*, where numeric serotypes are combined with the genus abbreviation (Jay, Loessner & Golden, 2005).
- **Incorporation**: Features such as pathogenic traits or host association are embedded in names like *Clostridium perfringens* ("breaking apart") (Tortora et al., 2016).
- **Folk Etymology**: Although less scientific, some names reflect misperceptions or visual associations, such as *Trichinella spiralis* for its "hair-like" (trichos) appearance (Black, 2008).

These morphological techniques illustrate the fusion of linguistic creativity with scientific utility to ensure precision and informativeness.

2.3. Standardization and Challenges in Microbial Nomenclature

The International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes (ICNP) outlines formal rules for naming bacteria and archaea, favoring Latinized binomials and requiring deposition of type strains (Lapage et al., 1992). However, advances in molecular biology, especially whole-genome sequencing, have led to the discovery of thousands of uncultured or unclassified microbes. Many of these remain unnamed due to the lack of phenotypic data and valid cultures, challenging the Linnaean system (Hugenholtz, 2002; Parks et al., 2020).

Automated systems like the Great Automatic Nomenclator (GAN) offer linguistic solutions by generating grammatically correct Latin names from taxonomic metadata (Whitman et al., 2019). Similarly, the Genome Taxonomy Database (GTDB) recommends genome-based naming hierarchies, balancing scientific precision with linguistic integrity.

2.4. Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Linguistics, Microbiology, and Food Science

Microbial taxonomy has practical implications in food science, where accurate identification of pathogens is vital. Recognizing that *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Listeria monocytogenes* denote species with distinct pathogenicity can guide food safety protocols (Jay et al., 2005). From a linguistic perspective, morphological analysis reveals cultural influences in naming, such as Eurocentric eponyms or Latin-based universalism, underscoring the role of language in scientific classification (Crystal, 2010).

Linguists, microbiologists, and food scientists increasingly collaborate to ensure microbial names are not only taxonomically valid but also linguistically robust and culturally neutral where possible (Brown, 2020). Such collaboration fosters clearer communication and pedagogical value in both scientific and lay contexts.

In conclusion, the morphology of microbial names reflects the dynamic relationship between language and science. Through processes like eponymy, compounding, loaning, and blending, microbial nomenclature encodes biological traits and historical narratives. As genomic technologies transform microbiology, linguistic insight remains crucial in shaping taxonomies that are not only scientifically accurate but also accessible and semantically meaningful.

3.0 Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, descriptive research design rooted in linguistic morphological analysis. A purposive sampling technique was used to select fifty (50) microorganism names relevant to food science and microbiology. These were drawn from reputable microbiological databases, academic sources, and food safety literature. The sampled names were categorized based on their effects on food into four groups: Beneficial Microorganisms, Spoilage Microorganisms, Pathogenic Microorganisms, and Other Food-Related Microorganisms (Neutral or Context-Dependent).

Each name was subjected to morphological parsing to identify its constituent morphemes (prefixes, roots, suffixes) and the linguistic origin of each component, with particular attention to Latin and Greek roots. The study further analyzed the morphological processes and naming strategies employed in the construction of each name. These include eponymy, compounding, loaning/borrowing, clipping, alphanumeric blending, loan-blending, incorporation, and folk etymology.

Data were analyzed manually through linguistic interpretation, cross-referenced with scientific literature to verify etymologies and naming rationale. This interdisciplinary approach allowed for a comprehensive evaluation of how language operates in the construction and communication of scientific knowledge in microbiology and food science.

4.0 Data

This section presents and analyzes fifty microorganism names categorized by their roles in food systems: beneficial, spoilage, pathogenic, and other food-related types. Each name undergoes morphological decomposition to identify constituent morphemes and uncover the linguistic strategies used in their construction, thereby revealing the intricate language-science interface in microbial taxonomy.

4.1 Presentation

Beneficial Microorganisms (Used in Food Production & Fermentation)

1. **Lactobacillus acidophilus** – used in yogurt, probiotic.
2. **Lactobacillus plantarum** – found in sauerkraut, pickles.
3. **Lactococcus lactis** – used in cheese making.
4. **Streptococcus thermophilus** – used in yogurt and cheese.
5. **Bifidobacterium bifidum** – probiotic in dairy products.
6. **Saccharomyces cerevisiae** – baker’s and brewer’s yeast.
7. **Saccharomyces bayanus** – used in wine fermentation.
8. **Penicillium camemberti** – used in making Camembert and Brie cheeses.
9. **Penicillium roqueforti** – used in blue cheeses like Roquefort.
10. **Leuconostoc mesenteroides** – used in sauerkraut and pickles.
11. **Acetobacter aceti** – used in vinegar production.
12. **Propionibacterium freudenreichii** – used in Swiss cheese (holes).
13. **Aspergillus oryzae** – used in soy sauce and miso.
14. **Aspergillus niger** – used in citric acid production.
15. **Zymomonas mobilis** – used in alcoholic fermentation.

Spoilage Microorganisms (Cause Food Spoilage)

16. **Pseudomonas fluorescens** – spoils dairy and meat.
17. **Clostridium putrefaciens** – causes spoilage in canned meat.
18. **Bacillus subtilis** – rots bread and other starchy food.
19. **Geotrichum candidum** – spoilage in dairy, fruits, and vegetables.
20. **Erwinia carotovora** – causes rot in vegetables.
21. **Penicillium expansum** – spoils fruits (produces patulin toxin).
22. **Rhizopus stolonifer** – black bread mold.
23. **Mucor racemosus** – spoils vegetables and dairy.
24. **Candida krusei** – spoilage yeast in dairy and beverages.
25. **Debaryomyces hansenii** – spoilage yeast in salted foods.

Pathogenic Microorganisms (Cause Foodborne Illnesses)

26. **Salmonella enterica** – found in raw poultry, eggs, etc.
27. **Escherichia coli O157:H7** – causes serious illness from contaminated beef or produce.
28. **Listeria monocytogenes** – found in unpasteurized dairy and cold cuts.
29. **Clostridium botulinum** – causes botulism from improperly canned foods.
30. **Clostridium perfringens** – common in reheated meats.
31. **Staphylococcus aureus** – found in improperly handled foods.
32. **Bacillus cereus** – found in rice and starchy foods.
33. **Campylobacter jejuni** – associated with raw/undercooked poultry.
34. **Vibrio cholerae** – associated with contaminated water and seafood.
35. **Vibrio parahaemolyticus** – linked to raw or undercooked seafood.
36. **Shigella spp.** – causes dysentery from contaminated food/water.
37. **Yersinia enterocolitica** – found in undercooked pork.
38. **Norovirus** – causes viral gastroenteritis; spread via contaminated food.
39. **Hepatitis A virus** – transmitted through contaminated food and water.
40. **Cyclospora cayetanensis** – parasite found in fresh produce.
41. **Giardia lamblia** – parasite in contaminated water.
42. **Toxoplasma gondii** – parasite in undercooked meat.
43. **Trichinella spiralis** – parasite in raw or undercooked pork.

44. **Anisakis simplex** – parasite in raw fish (sushi).
45. **Entamoeba histolytica** – amoeba in contaminated food/water.

Other Food-Related Microorganisms (Neutral or Context-Dependent)

46. **Micrococcus luteus** – found on cured meat surfaces.
47. **Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis** – sometimes found in dairy.
48. **Enterococcus faecium** – used in fermentation, but also opportunistic.
49. **Serratia marcescens** – can contaminate food and be opportunistically pathogenic.
50. **Halobacterium salinarum** – survives in salted foods.

4.2 Analysis

This section presents the morphological analyses of the data (a selection of microorganism names from Tables 1–3), based on observed morphological parameters, including eponymy, compounding, loaning/borrowing, loan-blending, alphanumeric blending, clipping, incorporation, and folk etymology.

Table 1: Morphological Analysis of Selected Beneficial Microorganisms

No.	Microorganism	Morphological Process Analysis
1	*Lactobacillus acidophilus*	**Compounding + Loaning**: Latin/Greek loan morphemes combined; philus from Greek, others Latin.
2	*Lactobacillus plantarum*	**Compounding + Loaning**: Latin *planta* + *lacto* and *bacillus*.
3	*Lactococcus lactis*	**Compounding + Loaning**: Latin and Greek roots; duplication (*lacto*, *lactis*) reflects functional emphasis.
4	*Streptococcus thermophilus*	**Compounding + Loaning**: Greek-derived morphemes; classic binomial compound.
5	*Bifidobacterium bifidum*	**Compounding + Loaning**: Reduplication (*bifido*-, *bifidum*) adds emphasis on morphology.
6	*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*	**Compounding + Loaning**: Greek + Latin; saccharo (Gr.) + cerevisia (Lat.) is a **loan-blend**.
7	*Saccharomyces bayanus*	**Compounding + Loaning + Eponymy (Toponymy)**: Geographic eponym (Bayeux); Latin/Greek compound.
8	*Penicillium camemberti*	**Loaning + Eponymy (Toponymy)**: Latin *penicillus* + Camembert (place/cheese) = folk naming.
9	*Penicillium roqueforti*	**Loaning + Eponymy (Toponymy)**: Place name adopted as Latinized species epithet.
10	*Leuconostoc mesenteroides*	**Compounding + Loaning + Folk Etymology**: *Nostoc* is debated, possibly invented or reinterpreted.
11	*Acetobacter aceti*	**Compounding + Loaning + Incorporation**: Aceto (vinegar) from Latin; incorporation of product (*aceti*).
12	*Propionibacterium freudenreichii*	**Loan-blending + Eponymy**: Propionic acid + Latin *bacterium* + named after Eduard Freudenreich.
13	*Aspergillus oryzae*	**Loaning + Eponymy (Product)**: Latin and rice (*oryza*); folk-inspired based on growth pattern resemblance.
14	*Aspergillus niger*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Latin-derived; *niger* = “black,” referencing color.
15	*Zymomonas mobilis*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Greek/Latin blend; *zymo*- and *mobilis* form a descriptive compound.

Table 2: Morphological Analysis of Selected Spoilage Microorganisms

No.	Microorganism	Morphological Process Analysis
16	*Pseudomonas fluorescens*	**Compounding + Loaning**: Greek *pseudo*- + Latin *fluorescens* = loan-blended compound.
17	*Clostridium putrefaciens*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Latin *putrefaciens* (putrefy) + Greek *klōstēr* (spindle).
18	*Bacillus subtilis*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Latin *bacillus* + *subtilis* (fine) – purely Latin compound.
19	*Geotrichum candidum*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Greek *geo*- + *thrix* + Latin *candidum* (white).

No.	Microorganism	Morphological Process Analysis
20	*Erwinia carotovora*	**Eponymy + Loaning + Compounding**: Named after Erwin + Latin *carota* + *vora*.
21	*Penicillium expansum*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Latin *penicillus* + *expansum* (spread).
22	*Rhizopus stolonifer*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Greek *rhiza*, *pous* + Latin *stolon*, *ifer*.
23	*Mucor racemosus*	**Loaning**: Latin *mucor* + *racemosus*; cluster imagery.
24	*Candida krusei*	**Loaning + Eponymy**: Latin *candida* + Kruse (named after discoverer).
25	*Debaryomyces hansenii*	**Eponymy + Compounding + Loaning**: Named after de Bary + Hansen + Greek *mykēs*.

Table 3: Morphological Analysis of Selected Foodborne & Food-Associated Microorganisms

No.	Microorganism	Morphological Process Analysis
26	*Salmonella enterica*	**Eponymy + Compounding**: *Salmon* (Daniel Salmon) + diminutive *-ella* + *enter-*.
27	*Escherichia coli*	**Eponymy + Loaning**: Theodor Escherich + Latin *coli* (colon).
28	*Listeria monocytogenes*	**Eponymy + Compounding + Loaning**: *Lister* + Greek *cyto*, *genes*, etc.
29	*Clostridium botulinum*	**Loaning + Folk Etymology**: Latin *botulus* (sausage) – folk link to sausage poisoning.
30	*Clostridium perfringens*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Latin *per* + *fringere* (to break) – descriptive of effect.
31	*Staphylococcus aureus*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Greek *staphyle* (grape) + Latin *aureus* (golden).
32	*Bacillus cereus*	**Loaning**: Latin *bacillus* + *cereus* (waxy).
33	*Campylobacter jejuni*	**Loan-blending + Loaning**: Greek *kampylos* + *bakterion* + Latin *jejuni* (small intestine).
34	*Vibrio cholerae*	**Loaning + Compounding**: Latin/Greek blend. *Cholera* has folk etymological evolution.
35	*Vibrio parahaemolyticus*	**Loan-blending + Compounding**: Greek/Latin; *para* + *haemo* + *lytic*.
36	*Shigella spp.*	**Eponymy**: Named after Kiyoshi Shiga – a straightforward case of **eponymy**.

4.3 Summary by Process:

1. **Eponymy**: 10, 12, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 36
2. **Compounding**: Almost all entries involve compounding of root morphemes.
3. **Loaning/Borrowing**: Nearly universal – Latin and Greek dominate scientific naming.
4. **Loan-blending**: 6, 12, 33, 35 (mixed Greek/Latin roots in one form).
5. **Incorporation**: 11 (*aceti* as product), 29 (*botulinum* referring to sausage).
6. **Clipping**: Minimal or absent (scientific names tend toward full morphemes).
7. **Alphanumeric Blending**: Not observed in scientific nomenclature.
8. **Folk Etymology**: 10 (*nostoc*), 13, 29, 34 – reinterpretation based on visual or cultural association.

5.0 Summary and Conclusion

5.1 Summary

This study conducted a comprehensive morphological analysis of selected beneficial, spoilage, and foodborne microorganisms by examining the structure, origins, and semantic components of their scientific names. Using parameters such as eponymy, compounding, loaning and borrowing, loan-blending, alphanumeric blending, clipping, incorporation, and folk etymology, the study reanalyzed the microbial nomenclature from linguistic and etymological perspectives.

A significant portion of the analyzed names displays a Greco-Latin hybrid morphology, where Greek and Latin morphemes are compounded to form descriptive and taxonomically meaningful terms (e.g., *Lactobacillus acidophilus* – "milk-loving acid-tolerant rod"). Eponymy was prevalent, with several microorganisms named in honor of scientists (e.g., *Escherichia coli*, *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Shigella spp.*), reinforcing the tradition of immortalizing pioneers in microbiology. Toponymic eponyms (e.g., *Saccharomyces bayanus*, *Penicillium camemberti*) highlight geographical origin, often connected to where the organism was first isolated or applied.
Loaning and borrowing are evidenced in the direct adoption of Greek and Latin roots, while loan-blending appears in combinations of these roots with modern descriptive terms. Some entries exhibit clipping and incorporation, especially where names are shortened from more complex Latin or Greek phrases or where descriptors are

embedded in compound words. Folk etymology appears marginally, mostly in misinterpretations of classical roots or oversimplified semantic associations by lay users, though scientific rigor generally prevents this in formal naming.

Furthermore, a subset of names shows semantic transparency, clearly describing the morphology (*Streptococcus*, "twisted berry"), physiology (*Thermophilus*, "heat-loving"), function (*Acetobacter*, "vinegar bacterium"), or habitat (*Enterica*, "intestinal") of the organisms. Others, particularly spoilage organisms like *Clostridium putrefaciens* or *Mucor racemosus*, communicate pathological or sensory properties like rot and slime, consistent with their roles in decomposition or contamination.

5.2 Conclusion

The morphological construction of microbial nomenclature serves a dual role: as a scientific classification tool and a semantic repository encoding biological, geographical, functional, and honorific information. This study demonstrates that the language of microbiology is deeply rooted in classical linguistic traditions, particularly Latin and Greek, while also incorporating modern processes such as eponymic naming, loan blending, and compounding to achieve clarity and precision in microbial taxonomy.

The prevalence of eponymy and compounding, alongside the occasional presence of loan blending and incorporation, suggests that scientific naming is not only descriptive but also commemorative and communicative. The morphology of these names reflects not just scientific facts but also cultural practices in taxonomy, revealing the intricate relationship between language and science. Ultimately, this analysis affirms that understanding the morphological and etymological structure of microbial names enhances not only lexical comprehension but also pedagogical accessibility in microbiological education and research.

References

Black, J. G. (2008). *Microbiology: Principles and Explorations* (7th ed.). Wiley.

Brown, P. (2020). Language and science: A cross-disciplinary dialogue. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40, 45–64.

Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Hugenholtz, P. (2002). Exploring prokaryotic diversity in the genomic era. *Genome Biology*, 3(2), reviews0003.1.

Jay, J. M., Loessner, M. J., & Golden, D. A. (2005). *Modern Food Microbiology* (7th ed.). Springer.

Lapage, S. P., Sneath, P. H. A., Lessel, E. F., Skerman, V. B. D., Seeliger, H. P. R., & Clark, W. A. (1992). *International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria: Bacteriological Code 1990 Revision*. American Society for Microbiology.

Linnaeus, C. (1753). *Species Plantarum*. Stockholm: Laurentius Salvius.

Madigan, M. T., Bender, K. S., Buckley, D. H., Sattley, W. M., & Stahl, D. A. (2018). *Brock Biology of Microorganisms* (15th ed.). Pearson.

Parks, D. H., et al. (2020). A complete domain-to-species taxonomy for Bacteria and Archaea. *Nature Biotechnology*, 38, 1079–1086.

Ryan, K. J., & Ray, C. G. (2004). *Sherris Medical Microbiology* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Singleton, P. (2004). *Bacteria in Biology, Biotechnology and Medicine* (6th ed.). Wiley.

Sneath, P. H. A. (1986). *Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology* (Vol. 2). Williams & Wilkins.

Tortora, G. J., Funke, B. R., & Case, C. L. (2016). *Microbiology: An Introduction* (12th ed.). Pearson.

Whitman, W. B., et al. (2019). Proposals to update the International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology*, 69(1), 1–5.