DISCUSSION

ONE-MAN CITATION OF AUTHORITIES FOR BOTANICAL NAMES

BOTANISTS should consider the advantages of the one-man citation of authorities for scientific names. As matters now stand it is difficult, when writing of plants, to do so without constantly turning to manuals for a verification of every one of those complex citations such as: *Luzula campestris* (Linnaeus) De Candolle, var. *multiflora* (Ehrhart) Čelak; or *Croton texensis* (Klotzsch) Mueller of Argau; or *Lappula Redowskii* (Hornemann) Greene, var. *occidentalis* (Watson) Rydberg. But it is a simple affair to recall *Quercus phellos* Linnaeus, *Quercus macrocarpa* Michaux, *Carpinus caroliniana* Walter, *Salix humilis* Marshall.

The zoologists have long reduced the authority citation to one man. Alas, it seems to me they have chosen in every case the wrong man! They have picked out *the original authority, who first described the species,* on the basis that he deserves the credit. But take the green heron, often given as *Butorides virescens* (Linnaeus). Suppose that we wish to return to the original description of this bird. Will we in all Linnaeus' writings find a creature under the name *Butorides virescens*? We will not, for the simple reason that Linnaeus never made such a combination. The green heron is almost hopelessly buried from us in his voluminous writings under the name *Ardea virescens,* while the author of the combination *Butorides virescens* is Bonaparte, and if zoologists would cite it that way we would have some idea how to trace our way back to an original description. Bonaparte will, almost of necessity, tell us whence he derived the name *virescens* that he has transferred to a new genus.

The botanical one-man citation, as it was formerly much used in this country and abroad, was the opposite of the zoologists' present system. It cites the man who transferred the specific name into the *correct* genus. Thus the pawpaw, now given as *Asimina triloba* (Linnaeus) Dunal, would be, under the one-man citation, simply *Asimina triloba* Dunal. This sort of citation would, in the aggregate, save hours of time for everyone who uses botanical nomenclature.

The objections to this type of citation are these:

(1) "The original author is deprived of credit." But the purpose of citing authorities is simply bibliographical. It is to distinguish John Doe's homonym from Richard Roe's. And to lead you back, *via* his name, to a printed description. The lure of giving credit is pernicious, encouraging the making of ill-founded species.

(2) "The one-man citation might encourage name-jugglers to attach their names to everything." But this is done with equal success under the two-man system. Look at the sport that Otto Kuntze and Dr. E. L. Greene had in transferring everybody's species into a very new, or a very old genus, and thus forcing you to mention them endlessly.

(3) One-man citations "conceal the history of the species." Why, except in elaborate taxonomic work, should it be revealed? Even then the one-man citation would still be enough for the titular name of the plant. The name-bringing synonym could be cited, along with all other synonyms, under the accepted name.

The double citation, in America, is a thing chiefly of the last forty years. In England and France it is still highly unpopular and often disregarded. The one-man citation was, in effect, used by De Candolle, Lamarck, the Hookers and Asa Gray, to mention but a few of the most famous names. The double citation is shallowly rooted in custom and could still be easily weeded up.

DONALD CULROSS PEATTIE

TREATMENT OF BLACKTONGUE WITH COZYMASE

THE report of Elvehjem, Madden, Strong and Woolley[1] that nicotinic acid will cure blacktongue of dogs has created considerable interest in the role of nicotinic acid in metabolism. Since codehydrogenase (cozymase) contains nicotinic acid, it seemed desirable to determine whether this substance, given in doses below the effective level of nicotinic acid, would have a curative effect on blacktongue.

Professor O. Warburg very kindly furnished us with 5 mg of diphosphopyridine nucleotide and 5 mg of triphosphopyridine nucleotide. Three milligrams of each preparation were given intramuscularly to a dog in an acute attack of blacktongue. No therapeutic effect was seen.

We then prepared approximately 200 mg of partially purified cozymase (diphosphopyridine nucleotide) according to the method of Meyerhof and Ohlmeyer.[2] A similar preparation is reported by them to be approximately 80 per cent. pure. The activity of our preparation and that of Warburg's triphosphopyridine nucleotide was determined by the growth-stimulating effect on *Haemophilus parainfluenzae,* according to the method of Lwoff and Lwoff.[3]

The order of activity of our preparation approximated that of Professor Warburg's material (in dilution of $1:2\times10^8$ in our hands).

Two dogs in an acute attack of blacktongue were

[1] C. A. Elvehjem, R. J. Madden, F. M. Strong and D. W. Woolley, *Jour. Amer. Chem. Soc.,* 59: 1767, 1937.

[2] O. Meyerhof and P. Ohlmeyer, *Biochem. Zeits.,* 290: 334, 1937.

[3] Andre Lwoff and Marguerite Lwoff, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* B. 122: 352, 1937.