Dr. Albert B. Sabin  
Dept. of Pediatrics, College of Medicine  
University of Cincinnati  
Cincinnati, Ohio  

Dear Doctor Sabin:

May I first congratulate you upon the excellent review which you have given in "Bacteriological Reviews" on the pleuropneumonia group of organisms. Careful reading shows it to be a most satisfying resume of our knowledge of the group.

I am particularly interested in your discussion of nomenclature. May I make several comments and ask some questions? I have not taken the time to verify references nor to look up the matter in detail, but the following points occur to me on casual examination.

1. On page 15 you note that the name "Asterococcus mycoides" was given to the organism of bovine pleuropneumonia by Borrel et al. On page 18 you note "Asterococcus canis" of Shoetensack. The genus was also recognized by me in 1918 and tentatively assigned to the subtribe Hemophilinae. Unless Asterococcus has been used previously in botany or in microbiology as a generic name, it definitely has priority over your suggested name Bovimyces.

I am puzzled to know why after citing Asterococcus with at least two species you do not mention it under your discussion of "Classification and Nomenclature." So far as the internal evidence of your paper is concerned, your designation Bovimyces would seem to be an invalid synonym of Asterococcus. Is Asterococcus to be invalid for any reason? I shall check it in Nomenclator Animalium and Index Kewensis, etc. as soon as I can find the time.

2. Item 96. Turner evidently definitely proposed the name Borrelomyces peripneumoniae for genus and species. You mention Turner's suggestion of Borrelomyceales as "inadvisable" because of the existence of a genus Borrelia. This last conclusion is difficult to justify, as Borrelomyces as a genus on which the order is based has definite priority over Bovimyces. I can find no provision in any nomenclatural code to justify dropping these
terms except that perhaps Asterococcus is valid and has definite priority.

3. The fixing of the name of the bovine pleuropneumonia organism is of considerable significance, as it constitutes the type.

4. It would seem on the basis of the evidence you cite, mycoides is the valid specific epithet. You give no reason for discarding it. The name would seem to be:

   Asterococcus mycoides if Asterococcus is not preoccupied.
   Borrelomyces mycoides if Asterococcus is preoccupied.

5. There is a genus Parasitus in the group Arachnida and a genus Parasitos among the Crustacea. The family name Parasitaceae means literally 'resembling Parasitus' and not 'made up of parasites'. It is almost universal custom under all codes to name the family after the type genus. Using your terminology it would have been better to have named it Bovimyctaceae. The proper term would probably be Asterococcaceae or (if Asterococcus is invalid) Borrelliomycetaceae.

6. It is further appropriate to name the order after the type family. Should it not have been Asterococcales or Borrelliomycetates or Bovimycetales?

7. Your choice of a name for the new class Paramycetes would seem to be entirely appropriate. Personally I believe that a review of the species of the Schizomycetes would show just as great variability in the morphology and pliomorphism, and just as much instability in form as are to be found in members of pleuropneumonia group. You, of course, are entirely in the right in proposing the new class name if you believe the forms to be sufficiently distinct from the other bacteria.

8. You have chosen to give generic names which in most cases are hybrid Latin and Greek. In general the nomenclatural codes recommend that this be avoided, but there are many precedents, and the names are not invalidated because they are hybrid.

9. I am puzzled by the lack of uniformity in the connecting vowel. The common connecting vowel in Latin compounds is \( i \). This you have used in Bovimyces and Murimyces. The common connecting vowel in Greek compounds is \( o \). This you have used in Capitomyces,
Canomyces and Musculomyces. Would not Boomyces be better Greek form? I am inclined to believe that Capromyces would be regarded as coming from the Greek capros meaning 'a wild boar' and not from caper, Latin for goat.

Would not Myomyces be better Greek for Musculomyces?

Sapromyces is made up of two Greek roots in correct form. However, I am puzzled by your use of Saprophytaceae instead of the entirely appropriate Sapromycetaceae as a family designation.

10. You state on page 18 that Shoetensack named the organism (for the dog) Asterococcus canis. I find no reason given in your paper for changing the specific name. It is entirely legitimate for you to suggest, as you do, that a new generic name should be given to the species from the dog. But should not the specific epithet have been retained? And the organism would then be Canomyces canis, which would seem to be satisfactory and appropriate.

11. What about the retention of the specific epithet muris from the Nelson name Actinobacillus muris?

May I make a suggestion without seeming to be presumptuous?

After examining the evidence fully with reference to the problems which have been posed above, and if any of the criticisms noted above are found to be valid, it would seem appropriate to ask for sufficient space in the next issue of Bacteriological Reviews for publication of amendments by the author. It has always seemed to me wise for the author rather than another to publish any needed corrections.

You have done such an admirable job in the body of your review that it will be unfortunate to do anything which will tend to fix invalid names in the literature, for eventually they will be abandoned.

May I express another hope. When the time is ripe, I hope you will monograph this group for the Monograph Series.

Sincerely yours,

R. E. Buchanan
Director
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