

naturally correct, being the accusative cases after the prepositions.

In regard to the perversion of the initial diphthong, I have nothing to say; that is usually the result of editorial pressure and it is far from my desire to kick against the pricks.

S. A. ASDELL

LABORATORY OF ANIMAL NUTRITION,
N. Y. STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

AN APOLOGETIC CORRECTION

It has come to my attention that I have, on the basis of insufficient information, done an injustice to the memory of George Compere in my recently published "History of Applied Entomology." In that book I have indicated that George Compere was responsible for the introduction and establishment in California, under the impression that it was a primary enemy of the black scale, of a secondary parasite (now known as *Quaylea whittieri*) which has destroyed very largely a very important primary parasite of the scale.

Mr. Harold Compere, son of the late George Compere, himself an advanced student of parasites and a thoroughly sound scientific worker, has access to the correspondence of his late father and has found in

this correspondence a distinct warning sent by George Compere to Alexander Craw (at that time in charge of the California state introductions of parasites) to the effect that this particular parasite might be a secondary and that he should be very careful about it.

This particular parasite belongs to the subfamily Encyrtinae, and at that time I knew no hyperparasite belonging to that group. Mr. Craw sent specimens to Washington for naming and for advice. I sent him a manuscript name given to it by the late Dr. W. H. Ashmead and told him that I knew of no hyperparasites of this group. This would seem to place the onus on me, and would do so were it not for the fact that I was in the habit of visiting California each year and had repeatedly talked with Mr. Craw on the subject of these parasites, warning him again and again not to liberate anything without making careful life history studies in the little quasi laboratory that he had fitted up in his office near the ferry building in San Francisco.

I gladly publish this statement, since George Compere was at one time a friend of mine and since I have the highest admiration and regard for his able son.

L. O. HOWARD

WASHINGTON, D. C.

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

La Parthénogénèse. By A. VANDEL. Vol. 7 of Bibliothèque de Biologie Générale. Paris; Gaston Doin et Cie., 1931, 412 pp., 42 figures in text. Price 32 francs.

It is a matter of surprise that prior to Professor Vandel's publication no thorough review of the subject of natural parthenogenesis had appeared, despite the prevailing tendency to summarize and digest the subject-matter of the different branches of biology. It is true that in 1920 Winkler collected a very large amount of the available findings in this field, but, aside from using it in weighing Ernst's hypothesis of hybridization as a cause of apogamy among plants, he made little use of this gathering of information. Vandel's book is therefore the first to give an adequate treatment of a subject, the extent and difficulty of which are attested by the 700 odd titles in the bibliography (which lists publications up to and including 1929). In accomplishing his task, Vandel takes up the subject under a number of wisely chosen headings. The treatment of the field observations and the breeding work under these headings is followed by a critical examination of the cytological findings, and this in turn is succeeded by a consideration of the possible points of contact with artificial parthenogenesis and a discussion of the question of sex de-

termination. Throughout, Vandel gives a concise and clear exposition of the questions at issue and I am in sympathy with his unexpressed view that in the present state of the subject it is always preferable to broach an hypothesis rather than to leave a question entirely open. If his wholly admirable suggestions are interspersed with a few that will hardly stand up under a strict test, it must be said that all are advanced with a commendable caution. Vandel's firm and well-founded insistence that haploid and diploid parthenogenesis are basically unrelated I can only applaud.

The book has few faults. The cytological illustrations are often inadequate, but this criticism applies more to their reproduction than to their selection. The fact that the bibliography is given under chapter headings instead of being presented in one continuous alphabetical list is not without its disadvantages, although the numbering of the titles is of some aid in locating references.

It is with pleasure that I commend this work, which, far from betraying the drudgery which must have accompanied its preparation, is written with spirit and brightness.

FRANZ SCHRADER

DEPARTMENT OF ZOOLOGY,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY