

INFILTRATION WITH PARAFFIN.—During the first 36 hours in the process of infiltration with paraffin the wood is kept *on* the paraffin bath, but shortly before the mixture of xylol and paraffin is replaced with pure melted paraffin; both the material and the paraffin mixture are transferred to a flat dish of some kind to facilitate a quick evaporation of the xylol and then placed *in* the bath. At least two or three changes of paraffin are usually desirable. Special care has to be taken at this point, the best results being obtained when such woody or partially woody material is carried through the final process of infiltration with paraffin (melting point 52° C.) from 48 to 72 hours.

SECTIONING.—With a proper allowance of time for infiltration, sections of the most refractory tissues ranging from 10 to 30 μ in thickness may be cut with a sliding microtome with perfect ease, and a complete series obtained by removing each section, as cut, from the knife and placing it directly upon a slide well coated with albumen fixative and flooded with water. All paraffin sections thus cut and not held in ribbon are likely to curl. To prevent this curling of the section as it comes upon the knife it has been the writer's practice, after flooding the surface of the object and the knife with water (using ice water in warm weather and slightly warmed water in cold weather), to hold a camel's hair brush or preferably the tip of the first finger lightly against the section as it is being cut. The section, unless of considerable size, will then adhere to the moist finger tip and can thus be transferred to the slide without danger of tearing or crushing. With practice sections may be cut and transferred from the microtome knife to the slide very rapidly by this method, and the problem of curling entirely obviated.

Subsequent stages in the fixing of sections to the slide, removal of paraffin, staining and mounting, follow the usual paraffin schedule.—
LADEMA M. LANGDON, *University of Chicago*.

CAMPHORINA VS. CINNAMOMUM

In a short article on the botanical nomenclature of the Pharmacopoeia, FARWELL¹ proposes to adopt the generic name *Camphorina* Noronha (1790) in place of *Cinnamomum* Blume (1825), although the latter, originally proposed by TOURNEFORT, had been used by LINNAEUS in the first edition of his *Systema* in 1735. It is not my object to discuss the validity of this proposed change, but aside from calling attention

¹ The Druggists Circular 62:535. 1918. The first paper of the series was published in Botanical Nomenclature of the U.S.P. IX, *op. cit.* 61:173-176. 1917.

to the fact that a considerable number of new names have been published in a strictly trade journal where they will probably not be noticed by systematists, attention should be called to the naïve and wholly unnecessary publication of the binomial *Camphorina saigonica* Farwell, a *nomen nudum*, as follows: "The Saigon Cinnamon. *Camphorina Saigonica*, n.sp. The plant producing the Saigon Cinnamon has not as yet been definitely determined, but it is generally supposed to be an undescribed species. The bark is well described in the U.S.P. on pages 114 and 115, and I tentatively propose the above name for the species producing it." In the opening statement it appears as *Cinnamomum saigonicum*, which may also be credited to FARWELL as a *nomen nudum*, although this is the name of the drug used in the 1905-1907 and 1916 editions of the U.S. Pharmacopoeia, where the comment is added: "The bark of an undetermined species of *Cinnamomum*." KRAEMER² states that Saigon cinnamon is obtained from *Cinnamomum Loureiri* (?) and other species cultivated in Cochin China and parts of China and exported from Saigon, so that it would appear that the species yielding the product is by no means generally assumed to be an undescribed species as FARWELL indicates.

Knowing from experience the great difficulty of identifying species of *Cinnamomum*, even when complete material is available, I communicated FARWELL'S proposition to Dr. A. CHEVALIER, Director of the Institut Scientifique in Saigon, the following quotation being from his letter of July 21, 1919: "Je vous remercie de m'avoir communiqué un renseignement bibliographique sur la cannelle de Saigon. Il n'existe pas dans le commerce de cannelle de Saigon. Celle qui est exportée par le port de Saigon a été achetée par les marchands chinois en Annam ou elle est fournie par le *Cinnamomum Loureiri* Nees." See also A. CHEVALIER in Bull. Écon., Indochine 22:526. 1919.

Although *Cinnamomum Loureiri* is not admitted by LECOMTE³ as an Indo-Chinese species, CHEVALIER is doubtless correct in his identification. From the very fact that 7 species of *Cinnamomum* are definitely known from southern China and that 11 are known from Indo-China, coupled with the fact that the accessible parts of both regions are fairly well explored from a botanical standpoint, it is unreasonable to assume that a commercially important species such as the one under consideration has escaped detection up to the present time.

² Botany and pharmacognosy, p. 513. 1910; Scientific and applied pharmacognosy, p. 304. 1915.

³ Fl. Gén. Indo-Chine 5:109-117. 1915.

Exception may well be taken to the proposed new names under KAVA,⁴ *Piper esculentum* Farwell, *Methysticum methysticum* Farwell, and *Methysticum esculentum* Farwell. These are proposed because *Piper methysticum* Forst. f. (1786) is assumed to be different from *P. methysticum* Linn. f. (1781). Before adopting the new names proposed by FARWELL it would be well to compare the actual types in London, as such comparison will probably show *Piper methysticum* Linn. f. and *P. methysticum* Forst. f. to be identical and based on material of the same (Forster's) collection. At any rate it would seem to be wholly unnecessary to publish *Piper esculentum* Farwell and *Methysticum esculentum* Farwell for the same species in the same article merely because there is a considerable difference of opinion among botanists as to the generic status of the plant in question. A taxonomist should be able to determine to his own satisfaction the status of a proposed genus before making transfers to it.—E. D. MERRILL, *Bureau of Science, Manila, P.I.*

⁴ FARWELL, O. A., Botanical nomenclature of the N[ational] F[ormulary] IV, *op. cit.* 61:229-232. 1917. There is a continuation of this paper, *op. cit.* 63:49, 50. 1919.



Merrill, Elmer D. 1920. "Camphorina vs. Cinnamomum." *Botanical gazette* 70(1), 84–86. <https://doi.org/10.1086/332711>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/109582>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/332711>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/224177>

Holding Institution

Missouri Botanical Garden, Peter H. Raven Library

Sponsored by

Missouri Botanical Garden

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Public domain. The BHL considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection.

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.