though I do not know what we can do now to correct our faulty condition, one hundred and forty years after the birth of our nameless nation. Would that our fathers had seized upon our beautiful nickname, "Columbia," for our own official designation, before our pugnacious southern neighbor Columbia had stolen it for herself!

J. S. Moore

Western Reserve University,
Cleveland, Ohio

To the Editor of Science: The name "America" inspires millions of individuals and the logical necessity for a name which is more specific, as pointed out by one of your correspondents in Science of July 5, will gain little acknowledgment and no popularity. Nevertheless the necessity remains and should be dealt with. The custom and sentiment of the masses is the deciding factor and any change can come only by a gradual transformation. If the term America, like Europe, Africa and Asia applies to a continent, as it does, then American implies Canadian, Brazilian and Patagonian just as well. We have in our case the modifying factor of "United States," which, as the correspondent puts it: "is lacking an adjective." To supply this adjective another name is needed. Why not hit two marks in one stroke by printing upon our postage stamps: USoNA? Perhaps this name might gain popularity and would permit an adjective "Usonian." At the same time the most numerous representatives of the nation would sail under a more specific label: U. S. o. N. A. instead of U. S. POSTAGE. Incidentally I wonder how long the inaccurate use of U. S. A. will survive. It has often been pointed out that U. S. A. is the official abbreviation for "United States Army" and U. S. N. for the navy, while U. S. means the United States and U. S. N. A. the United States of North America. Perhaps an experiment with postage stamps, as suggested above, may educate the people to use Usona, or the correct U. S.

Ingo W. D. Hackh

Berkeley, Calif.

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

City Milk Supply. By Horatio Newton Parker. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 486.

The author's purpose is plainly set forth in the brief preface, namely to give much-needed information on the broad subject of milk production, transportation and control of purity. This purpose he has admirably accomplished. The book seems complete in itself. The subject matter is divided into seven chapters, as follows: I. Milk; II., Diseases Communicable in Milk; III., Dairy Cattle and the Dairy Farm; IV., Sanitary Milk Production; V., Transportation of Milk; VI., The Milk Contractor, and VII., Control of the Public Milk Supply.

Printed in somewhat compact form, in good bold type and on good paper, the different topics are presented clearly, and in many parts with the first-hand information and understanding of the various difficult problems which only one who has spent many years of study in this field is able to give.

In the chapter on diseases communicable in milk the treatment of tuberculosis is particularly instructive. The tuberculin test, and the present-day controversy regarding its value and enforced application are discussed at some length and without bias. Septic sore throat likewise comes in for a good share of the writer's attention.

A comprehensive history of the score card system of rating dairies, and a full discussion of its merits and of its serious limitations will be found to be interesting and illuminating. The importance which the author attaches to the bacteriological examination of milk is most gratifying to those who have long lent their support to its complete adoption as a method of controlling sanitary milk production. A good account is given also of the origin and pernicious influence of the so-called "slop dairy," and of the long struggle that has been waged for improved feeding and housing conditions in the dairy barn.

The author has been particularly successful in his treatment of the material in the chapter on the milk contractor. The peculiar

relations of the contractor to both the producer and consumer are well portrayed, and the many and almost insurmountable problems of bringing milk to the doors of the consumers in as pure a state, and as quickly as possible, without prohibitive cost, are clearly presented and discussed from every possible angle. The pages in the last chapter on municipal and state control of milk production and distribution, with types of ordinances as examples, should be of much interest to health officers and milk inspectors. The practical application of scientific principles to milk production, and the different bacteriological and chemical methods and standards for controlling the purity of milk, receive their due share of attention. The book concludes with a discussion of infant mortality.

It is unfortunate that grammatical errors should have been allowed to creep into the book here and there, as for example the following: "Enough data *has* been collected" (page 180), and "the relations between the farmer and city milkman *is* delicate"; and in the use of scientific names, as for instance in "streptococci, staphylococci and *bacteria* were found." A very common error in punctuation is the absence of the comma between the principal parts of a compound sentence, especially where the conjunctive "but" is used. These are, however, but minor defects which will undoubtedly be eliminated from future editions.

The author does not claim originality, but as he states, has drawn from a wide field of experience of others, experts in their own domain, who have been given full credit, and to whose work references are given at the end of the individual chapters. Throughout the book original tables and illustrations materially add to its value.

LEO F. RETTGER
SHEFFIELD SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL,
YALE UNIVERSITY

SPECIAL ARTICLES

CORPUS LUTEUM AND THE PERIODICITY IN THE SEXUAL CYCLE

IN a recent paper G. W. Corner and F. H. Hurni report on experiments in which they injected intraperitoneally rats with suspensions of corpus luteum preparations.[1] In all but one animal the substance prepared by Armour & Company was used.

While Corner and Hurni find that such injections may cause peritoneal adhesions and peritonitis, they failed to inhibit ovulation. So far the experiments of these authors are essentially in agreement with the results not mentioned by Corner and Hurni which I previously obtained in guinea-pigs.[2] I stated:

> While in some injected guinea-pigs ovulation was apparently delayed, in others it took place at the expected term despite the fact that these animals had repeatedly received large doses of lutein. We may therefore conclude that injections of lutein extract can not wholly take the place of the living corpus luteum. Whether or not they can do so partially in mammals, I am not prepared to say on the evidence at hand.

Some details as to doses used in these experiments are found in a paper in which in conjunction with Dr. Cora Hesselberg I reported on the effect of such injections on the cycle of the mammary gland in the guinea-pig.[3]

Our experiments on the effect of injections of corpus luteum substance had been suggested through positive results which R. Pearl and Surface had previously published concerning the retarding effect of such injections on the ovulation in birds.[4]

We emphasized the negative character of our results, because a slight delay in ovulation can be induced in the guinea-pig through various experimental interferences, and especially did we find that undernourishment prevented the normal maturation of follicles.[5]

The experiments in which ovulation oc-

[1] George W. Corner and Felix H. Hurni, *American Journal of Physiology*, 1918, XLVI., 483.

[2] Leo Loeb, "Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics," 1917, XXV., 300.

[3] Leo Loeb and Cora Hesselberg, *Journal Exper. Medicine*, 1917, XXV., p. 305.

[4] Raymond Pearl and F. M. Surface, *Journal Biol. Chem.*, 1914, XIX., p. 263.

[5] Leo Loeb, *Biological Bulletin*, 1917, XXXII., p. 91.