also implies that amniotic fluid originates from maternal rather than fetal sources is worth consideration. The probable influence of antiglucuronidase (inhibitor) (W. H. Fishman, K. J. Altman, and B. Springer. *Fed. Proc.*, 1948, 7, 154) on these changes is under investigation by one of us (W. H. F.).

LESTER D. ODELL, WILLIAM H. FISHMAN, and WALTER R. HEPNER

Departments of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Surgery and Pediatrics, The University of Chicago and *Chicago Lying-In Hospital*

More About Ridgway's *Color standards and color nomenclature*

The account in *Science* (June 11, pp. 626–628) by Illman and Hamly on the unreliability of Ridgway's classic volume was very interesting. The authors seem not to have realized, however, that there is more than one edition of Ridgway's work. Some of the data they tabulate appear to concern copies of different editions and hence give somewhat false criteria by which to judge the imperfections of the book. The particular copy that they call the "good copy" is almost certainly one of the reprints, and perhaps others of the series examined are of the same sort.

Presumably because of the continuing demand for Ridgway's work, after the edition was exhausted, the printers of that volume undertook to reissue the work about 1937, using an undetermined number of leftover sheets and preparing new ones to fill the gaps—without the benefit of Ridgway's personal attention, since he had died some years previously. Still later, about 1940, an entirely new set of plates was projected, but whether they were issued or not I am unable to say. Unfortunately, no indication was given on the title page or in the letterpress that the new books were different from the originals, although there are minor distinctions that are apparent on comparison with an original, other than those found in the colors themselves. The colors in a great many cases are far from accurate counterparts of those of Ridgway's own preparation.

Of two original copies immediately available, one has been very little used, while the other has seen continuous service for the last 18 years. Although both show some spotting and discoloration—much more evident in the heavily used copy—the unaffected portions are identical in both or so nearly alike that a colored object matched in one set would find the same place in the other. On the other hand, a relatively new copy of the reissued work is decidedly different from the others. The differences, I am sure, are due not to deterioration of the older examples but to faulty preparation of the reissue.

I have no wish to criticize the *Mursell book of color* of which Illman and Hamly speak so highly. It is indeed a fine work, and one may hope that the pigments used in its preparation will prove to be more permanent than some of those available to Ridgway in 1912. I maintain, however, that Ridgway's *Color standards and color nomenclature* has not deteriorated so much and is not so useless as we are asked to believe. The problem is one of keeping references restricted to the original work, which I admit is difficult, since the printers have given no unequivocal clue to the reprints as they should have done. Whether the reprints are uniform among themselves also remains to be determined by someone with access to a number of copies. At any rate, they should not enter into a judgment of the original work.

JOHN T. ZIMMER

American Museum of Natural History, New York City

A Method for Recovery of Platinum From Potassium Iodoplatinate

In attempts to recover platinum from potassium solutions derived from the chloroplatinate colorimetric procedure (C. Hurwitz and H. W. Batchelor. *Soil Sci.*, 1947, 63, 351–359), it was found that recovery of the platinum from the chloroplatinate excess was fairly easy when the zinc-hydrochloric acid method was used. However, after the potassium chloroplatinate precipitate was converted to potassium iodoplatinate by buffering to pH 1.5 with potassium chloride and hydrochloric acid and adding potassium iodide, recovery of the platinum from the iodoplatinate solution was found to be extremely difficult, if not impossible. A search of the literature revealed no clues regarding possible methods of recovery of iodoplatinates.

Since a considerable volume of iodoplatinate solution was on hand, it was decided to try to find some method of reclaiming the platinum. Addition of a base followed by heat and subsequent addition of zinc and hydrochloric acid yielded no platinum precipitate, nor were substitutions of other acids for hydrochloric acid successful. Replacing the iodine in the iodoplatinate by passing chlorine gas through the solution yielded a solution from which a platinum precipitate could be obtained if the iodine were sublimed and removed in the gaseous state or separated out by filtration. However, this method of recovery would probably be as costly as the amount of platinum recovered and would be dangerous to the worker if there should be a chlorine leak. The iodoplatinate solution was found to yield a platinum precipitate upon addition of hydrochloric acid and zinc only if it had stood for a week or more before the zinc and acid were added. It was not found possible to do this with freshly developed potassium iodoplatinate. Further study of this problem is in progress.

MARTHA K. ROANE

Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station