cytochemically (*5*); however, although lymphocyte mitochondria stain only very slightly with alcoholic Sudan black, following acid treatment their staining reaction is markedly enhanced. (4) Plasma lipids are unmasked by acid treatment, although a longer fixation time (i.e., 5 min) is necessary.

It is generally considered that lipids stain blue or black with a 70% alcoholic solution of Sudan black. Therefore, this technique may be criticized because a brown color is obtained in certain cellular components (nuclei and platelets) after acid treatment. This objection is minimized by the observations discussed above, as well as by several additional facts: (1) Sudan black prepared in 40% ethyl alcohol yields a brown solution; in 70% alcohol the solution is blue-black. Although the distribution and amount of sudanophilic material present in cells are identical after staining with these solutions, the color is different (brown with a 40% dye solution and black with a 70% dye solution). A similar color difference is obtained in the liposomes of the rat adrenal gland, as well as in adipose tissue (frozen sections). (2) The sudanophilic rim of the blood eosinophil granule is considered to be lipid (*4*), although it stains brown rather than black in control preparations stained with 70% alcoholic Sudan black.

The lipids of the mitochondria and blood platelets may be unmasked more readily using more dilute acid solutions than can the lipid of the nuclei. The differences in the color of the nuclei, platelets, and mitochondria following acid treatment and staining with Sudan black are suggestive of a difference in the type or form of phospholipid or lipoprotein complex. The mechanism by which lipid is unmasked by weakly ionizable acids is not known. However, the acids may act by dissociating or splitting the lipoprotein complexes and allowing the lipid to be accessible to the dye.

References

1. COHEN, I. *Stain Technol.*, **24**, 177 (1949).
2. LEACH, E. H. *J. Path. Bact.*, **47**, 637 (1938).
3. STONEBURG, C. A. *J. Biol. Chem.*, **129**, 189 (1939).
4. BLOOM, M. L., and WISLOCKI, G. B. *Blood*, **5**, 79 (1950).
5. ACKERMAN, G. A. Unpublished data.

Manuscript received December 31, 1951.

Comments and Communications

Common Names for Subspecies in Zoology

INEVITABLY, the science of one's own time seems somehow different in quality from the science of the past. No doubt Linnaeus's teacher, Olof Rudbeck the Younger, in the early 1700s, had the same feeling when he looked back on the science of Conrad Gesner; and Gesner himself must have felt the same way as he contemplated the works of Pliny. When we read the history of science with a discerning eye, we realize, perhaps with some surprise, that to students in the far future (if there are any) the apparently solid and sober structure of our contemporary science will be seen to be shot through with obvious errors and absurdities.

One of the latter—a minor one to be sure—will probably be the present fad of giving so-called common names (in reality, usually mere book names) to every subspecies of animal described by naturalists. The writer, be it understood, has no quarrel with standardized common names for easily recognizable and valid species. In a relatively few instances, such as that of the Common Canada Goose and the Cackling Goose, it would seem to be proper to assign common names even to subspecies. Neither does he question the necessity for giving *technical* names to valid subspecies. What he does object to as unnecessary and even ridiculous is the current fashion of publishing such names, to take a fanciful example, as Rufous-crowned Gray Dinglebat, Purple-sided Gray Dinglebat, Southern Plains Dinglebat, and Smith's Dinglebat for, let us say, four subspecies of critters which everyone has for generations called simply Gray Dinglebats, and which nobody but a specialist on dinglebats can tell apart anyway.

To take one real example, from the multitude available, in the serpent fauna of New Mexico *Pituophis catenifer* is known to all and sundry in my part of the country as the Bull Snake. In New Mexico there are three recognized subspecies of this snake—*P. sayi, P. affinis,* and *P. deserticola.* In the recently issued second edition of C. B. Perkins's *Key to the Snakes of the United States,* a standard reference work, I find these listed, respectively (p. 9), as Bull Snake, Sonoran Gopher Snake, and Great Basin Gopher Snake. Yet nobody but an ophiologist can tell them apart, and to the average English-speaking person in New Mexico they remain simply Bull Snakes. Biologists, likewise, almost always use the scientific names or just call the animals Bull Snakes. Possibly biologists farther west call them Gopher Snakes, but the principle is the same. Who, then, is supposed to use these complicated common names? And what about the individuals of *P. catenifer* in areas (extensive, be it noted) where *P. sayi* and *P. affinis* intergrade? If we accept the above-mentioned trinomial system of common names, these unlucky intergrading individuals are neither "bulls" nor "gophers" and presumably have no common name at all. Furthermore, turmoil is added to confusion when we note with dismay that Schmidt and Davis in their widely used *Field Book of Snakes of the United States and Canada* (p. 163) call Perkins' *P. c. affinis* the Arizona Bull Snake in-

stead of Sonoran Gopher Snake. The fact that since 1941, when the *Field Book of Snakes* was published, systematists have reduced *sayi* from a full species to a subspecies does not seem to justify a Bull Snake suddenly becoming a Gopher Snake, at least in common parlance.

Would it not be better, in works intended for the intelligent section of the general public, to list all the subspecies of *P. catenifer* simply as "Bull Snake or Gopher Snake," being content to let each person make his own choice, depending on local usage in his area? The principle is widely applicable.

Smith and Kennedy (*Herpetologica,* 7, [3], 93 [1951]) have recently proposed that *P. catenifer* be merged with *P. melanoleucus,* the Pine Snake. Should this proposed change in nomenclature win acceptance, fresh difficulties in the matter of common names within the genus appear certain to arise just as soon as compilers and revisers of general manuals catch up with the change. This prospective situation further emphasizes the desirability of trying to keep common names truly common, and of refraining from coining them where they do not already exist in actual use. If this recommendation were followed, new, common name difficulties would not arise whenever the systematists revise their schemes of classification.

Nomenclature is fundamental to an orderly knowledge of any faunal group, so let us by all means have recognized names, including standardized common names; but let us also have common sense along with them.

HOWARD CAMPBELL
New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
Albuquerque

Problems Involved in a World-Wide Soil Survey

WITH the increasing realization of the important part that certain metallic elements, present in trace concentrations in soils, play in plant, animal, and human nutrition, it is but natural that suggestions should be made for a world-wide soil survey in order to determine the extent and location of deficiencies. This is the subject of a short article by K. Starr Chester entitled "Trace Minerals in Food Production and Health" in this journal (SCIENCE, **115**, 3 [Jan. 11, 1952]). He has discussed the project in general terms, pointing out the advantages of a central laboratory employing spectrographic methods for the chemical analyses. This is unquestionably our most efficient tool for such a survey, but I would like to discuss some of the practical considerations of time, instruments, and personnel involved in such a program.

The nonmetallic minerals of which soils are composed require the carbon arc as the source for spectrochemical analyses. Such considerations as ease of handling and representativeness of sample indicate a sample weight of 10–20 mg. A sample of this size requires an exposure of about 2.5 min, so that about 25 can be exposed in 1 hr. This figure determines the maximum output of the spectrograph. For such a routine a laboratory crew of about 8 is needed, for such operations as preparing the samples and electrodes, attending the spectrograph, measuring, and calculating. For the field work of collecting, quartering down, and dispatching of samples, a unit of 3 should be able to handle about 50 samples/day, or a total of 12 people for the 200 samples required each day. For personnel, therefore, a total of 20 is needed to serve one spectrograph for each 8-hour day. For maximum use of the laboratory, operations should be on a two-shift basis; this will double production to 2,000/week, or 100,000 samples/year, with a working force of 40.

At this point an estimate must be made of the average sampling density, which, as we do not yet know the degree of variability of the trace element concentrations, must be a guess. Too high a density would be wasteful of time and labor; too low would endanger the worth of the whole survey. It would vary with locality, and adjustments will be made as data accumulate. Assuming, therefore, a density of 1 sample/5 acres, the annual output of one spectrograph will then survey half a million acres.

In the continental U. S. there are approximately 350 million acres in crops alone, excluding pasture, woodland, and forest. Working with one spectrograph, therefore, this limited survey will require 700 years! Obviously, we must enlarge our thinking on this problem; what is required is not a small group operating one or two spectrographs but a huge establishment of a thousand people operating a battery of 20 or 30 instruments, with costs running to several million dollars per year.

MORRIS SLAVIN
Department of Chemistry
Brookhaven National Laboratory

An Improved Moist Chamber

BIOLOGISTS make frequent use of moist chambers in the course of their investigations. The usual moist chamber consists of 2 loosely fitting glass dishes superimposed upon each other to form a closed chamber, which is humidified by lining the bottom of the lower dish with wet filter paper, paper toweling, etc. Mycological investigations carried out by the writer have been hampered by the ability of fungi and bacteria to contaminate otherwise isolated test specimens by growing across the dampened surface.

This difficulty has been overcome by using cellulose sponge yarn[1] as the humidifying agent. This material is made up of cellulose sponge molded in a circular cross-sectional pattern around a solid core and extended into various lengths. The yarn has a high water-holding capacity and is easily cut and handled. A piece of yarn can be arranged around the inner wall of the moist chamber bottom clear of free water. Water may be added to the yarn periodically to main-

[1] This yarn was provided for experimental purposes by the Film Division of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company, Inc., Wilmington, Del.