DISCUSSION

THE BREATHING MECHANISM OF TURTLES

THE commonly accepted statement that turtles breathe air in a manner essentially similar to frogs is in serious error. Most of the text-books that mention the breathing mechanism of the turtle have perpetuated the respected opinion of Louis Agassiz[1] and many others that the air is pumped into the lungs by throat action. Casual observation of any turtle will show that the hyoid apparatus does indeed produce movements like those in the Amphibians. It is not surprising, therefore, that such actions should be deemed the essential mechanism of breathing.

During the course of operative experiments upon the box turtle in which the body cavity was opened it became obvious that throat action was ineffective and probably had nothing to do with the case. Further experiments to test the efficacy of the hyoid apparatus and to ascertain what did cause the movements of inhalation and exhalation indicated that the whole action was performed by distinct respiratory muscles in the body and not by the throat. That turtles with broken imperfect jaws continue to breathe and live with an impossible and leaking mouth pump, that there are no valves in the nostrils of turtles, and that experimentally the mouth may be tied open indefinitely without affecting the animal's breathing should explode the notion of a mouth pump. Further, tracheotomy shows no air movements in the trachea during the expansion and contraction of the throat. The throat actions do result in aeration of the mouth, and in aquatic turtles where water is taken in and out of the mouth, it affords respiration through the lining of the mouth and pharynx. This has been shown by S. H. and S. P. Gage[2] in 1885.

In his excellent book "Turtles of the United States and Canada," Mr. Pope[3] puts no faith in throat action, but points out that it appears to be a rotation of the girdles which is responsible for the chief respiratory movements. This is an interesting view but somewhat obscure. It is doubtful whether the pelvic girdle should be considered in this regard, but it is true that the pectoral girdle does rotate during the respiratory movements.

The essence of the whole mechanism has been adequately described in a paper by S. Weir Mitchell and George R. Morehouse[4] published in 1863, and apparently forgotten by the subsequent generations of comparative anatomists. Briefly, inspiration is accomplished by two flank muscles which, acting like the mammalian diaphragm, enlarge the coelom and thus suck air into the lungs. The shoulder girdle passively rotates forward during inhalation. To accomplish expiration, the turtle uses an expiratory muscle consisting of two anterior and two posterior bellies connected by a tendinous band continuous across the mid-ventral line, and common to both sides of the animal. Air is forced out by the concerted action of the four parts of this muscle which compress the viscera against the lungs. This action may be aided by pulling in the legs and neck which thus further tend to decrease the body cavity. It has been clearly shown that girdle, leg or neck movements need not take place. The muscles mentioned are entirely adequate to the task. It follows then that an open body cavity will stop breathing. It is easy to demonstrate with the use of a manometer attached to the coelom that the pressure momentarily dips during inspiration and rises during expiration.

Dr. Simon H. Gage,[5] writing in 1883, says: "During the last twenty-five years the mechanism of respiration in the Chelonia has been investigated with considerable thoroughness both in this country and Europe; and at present the Chelonian form of respiration is considered to be comparable with that of the mammal rather than that of the frog, as formerly supposed." In spite of misleading text-books, the suspicion is strong that the turtles have not changed since.

IRA B. HANSEN
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

NICOTIANA RUSTICA CULTIVATED BY PUEBLO INDIANS

IN 1934, while engaged in an ethnologic study of the Indian Pueblo of Tamaya (commonly called by its Spanish name, Santa Ana, located on the Jemez river about 25 miles north of Albuquerque), I was told by an Indian informant that tobacco was cultivated by a certain individual at the pueblo's farms at Ranchitos (on the east bank of the Rio Grande, just north of Bernalillo, N. M.). Subsequently, I learned that this individual was a member of a society of medicine men and that the tobacco was grown for ceremonial use. I obtained a specimen of this tobacco. It has been identified as *Nicotiana rustica* by Mr. Volney H. Jones, ethnobotanist in the Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, to whom I am indebted for much assistance in the preparation of this paper. The specimen has been deposited in the Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan (Cat. No. 14698). In

[1] Louis Agassiz, "Contributions to the Natural History of the United States," Vol. 1, p. 281, 1857.

[2] S. H. Gage and S. P. Gage, *Proceedings American Association Advancement Science,* Vol. 34, pp. 316–318, 1885.

[3] C. H. Pope, "The Turtles of the United States and Canada," 1939.

[4] S. Weir Mitchell and George R. Morehouse, *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge,* Vol. 13, No. 159, 1863.

[5] S. H. Gage, *Proceedings American Association Advancement of Science,* Vol. 32, pp. 316–318, 1883.

1936, Mr. Jones himself saw tobacco under cultivation at the Indians' farms at Ranchitos and was told by an Indian that this was the kind of tobacco commonly grown and used by them. Mr. Jones judged this tobacco to be *N. rustica,* although he did not have the opportunity to make definitive identification at that time.

This discovery is of interest for two reasons: (1) There is very little evidence indeed to indicate that tobacco of any kind has ever been cultivated by the Pueblo Indians of the Southwest; and (2) it is surprising to find this particular species of *Nicotiana* in this region.

Ad. F. Bandelier, who made first-hand studies of the Pueblo Indians in the 1880's and who was intimately acquainted with the documentary history of the pueblos, has declared that "tobacco was not known to the Pueblos until Spanish rule became established."[1] John H. Bowman, an Indian agent of the "Navajo Agency, New Mexico," in a report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs dated September 9, 1884, states that the Hopi cultivated tobacco "to an insignificant extent" (p. 137). George Vasey states that *N. rustica* "was cultivated by the Indians in New Mexico and Arizona, as observed by Dr. Ed. Palmer."[2] Considerable search has failed to discover this statement in the publications of Dr. Palmer. But, in one of Palmer's papers, we find evidence to the contrary: he states that *N. attenuata, N. trigonophylla* and *N. bigelovia* were used by the Indians of the Southwest, but implies that they were not cultivated.[3] Robbins *et al.* state that the Tewa Indians of north central New Mexico "formerly cultivated" *N. attenuata,* but cite no evidence whatsoever in support of this claim.[4] A. F. Whiting lists *N. attenuata* and *N. trigonophylla* as the tobaccos used by the Hopi Indians and remarks that "it is said that tobacco is cultivated sporadically."[5] Mr. V. H. Jones observed a few plants of *N. attenuata* growing here and there, at random, among other plants in gardens near the Hopi pueblo of Walpi. He was told by a trustworthy Hopi that these tobacco plants had not been planted, that they had come up of their own accord, but the gardeners had allowed them to remain and that they would be harvested eventually. This might be called "semi-cultivation." Thus, the specimen collected by myself at Ranchitos and the observations of Mr. Jones at the same place, constitute the only conclusive evidence of intentional and systematic cultivation of tobacco among the Pueblo Indians of which the present writer is aware.[6]

Our discovery of *N. rustica* at Ranchitos is the only conclusive evidence of the existence of this species in the Southwest that we have. We know of only one other claim that this species has been found in this region, *viz.,* the statement previously quoted from Vasey. But, as we have seen, this statement is opposed, rather than supported, by the authority whom Vasey cites. Wm. A. Setchell, in "Aboriginal Tobaccos,"[7] states that *N. rustica* was cultivated in the Eastern Woodland and the Southeastern culture areas. The western boundary of *N. rustica,* according to Setchell, "is probably along the line of the eastern boundary of the 'Plains area' as outlined by Wissler [in 'The American Indian']," *i.e.,* but a short distance west of the Mississippi River (p. 402). The Southwestern area, says Setchell, "used an entirely different species, *viz., Nicotiana attenuata* Torrey," (p. 410). He also places *N. trigonophylla* in the Southwest, "ranging from southeastern California to the western borders of Texas" (pp. 412–13).

N. rustica is believed to have originated in Mexico and to have entered the Southeast "through the southwestern corner of Texas," (Setchell, p. 410). The presence of this species under cultivation at Tamaya to-day remains to be explained. It may have been introduced within the past 50 years or so from some eastern Indian reservation, to be sure. But the possibility that it may be a relic of the original diffusion from Mexico can not be entirely dismissed at this time.

LESLIE A. WHITE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[1] *Final Report,* etc., Pt. I, p. 37 (Papers of the Archeological Institute of America; Amer. Series III; 1890).

[2] Report of the botanist, p. 76 (in Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for 1886).

[3] "Plants used by the Indians of the United States," p. 650, *American Naturalist,* Vol. 12, 1878.

[4] W. W. Robbins, J. P. Harrington and B. Freire-Marreco, "Ethnobotany of the Tewa Indians," p. 103, Bull. 55, Bureau of American Ethnology, 1916.

[5] "Ethnobotany of the Hopi," p. 90, Bull. 15, Museum of Northern Arizona, 1939.

[6] Professor E. F. Castetter, of the University of New Mexico, who has been making studies of plants used by the Pueblo Indians, may have data on this point.

[7] *American Anthropologist,* 23: 397–414, 1921.

CERVICAL EXPOSURE AND ABRASION IN HUMAN TEETH FOR DIFFERENT AGE CLASSES[1]

THERE are numerous references in dental literature to the existence and cause of abraded areas along the gingival margin of human teeth, but the degree of incidence of this condition has not been determined. From clinical data recently collected, it appears that this incidence is unexpectedly high. For these reasons a preliminary report is presented at this time.

Two hundred individuals, divided equally as to sex, and into four age groups, 20–29, 30–39, 40–49 and 50–59, were examined. The examination consisted of measuring the linear extent of exposed cementum or dentin, on the buccal, or labial, surface of each tooth

[1] A project of the Research Foundation, the Ohio State University, carried on with the aid of a grant from the Procter and Gamble Company.