paper had been duly published; hence the names were on the same status as those in any other paper. Having so decided, it could not answer Dr. Aldrich's question of whether the 1800 names were valid, because that embraced as many taxonomic questions as there were names involved, did not fall in the province of nomenclature, and lay outside the scope of the Commission.

The results of Mr. Edwards' 1932 questionnaire were never laid before the Commission, nor was the Commission asked to take any action by Mr. Edwards.

But in 1932 the Fifth International Congress of Entomology adopted (with dissenting voices) a four to two majority resolution of its Committee on Nomenclature and transmitted it to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for action. This resolution definitely recommended that the names of Meigen (1800) be sustained. I was present at that Committee meeting and was, I think, one of the two who voted against the resolution, but I do recall that it was championed by an eminent dipterist.

The resolution presented an impossible request to the International Commission. No such body could properly establish a blanket validation of any long list of generic names, least of all names with which no species had originally been connected, and the correct application of which could therefore individually be highly debatable on zoological rather than nomenclatorial grounds. The Commission has always followed a policy of refusing to act on blanket requests.

In Opinion 152 (adopted in 1935) the Commission politely refused to accede to the request of the Fifth International Entomological Congress. The explanation of the situation by Secretary Hemming, published in the Opinion, is very clear. The Commission went further and advised dipterists or others interested that they would welcome petitions to suspend the rules in any given case where the Meigen names cause confusion.

It is no part of the function of the Commission to initiate such action, or any action. Its function is judiciary and may be likened to that of the Supreme Court of the United States in interpreting the meaning of our Constitution as applied to individual situations that may arise. It would be a woeful ignorance of judicial procedure that would expect our Supreme Court on its own initiative to seek out dubious situations and to render a decision covering them.

The blame for the confusion in regard to the Meigen names falls squarely on the shoulders of dipterists. Had any one of them, after the Commission was given authority to suspend the rules (by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology, 1913), presented petitions to the Commission requesting suspension of the rules in regard to any or each of the Meigen names that are found obnoxious, each petition individually would have been acted upon, and by now the names involved would either have been definitely adopted, or rejected in favor of certain others. Even Edwards, after taking the pains to circularize dipterists as to their opinion upon the Meigen names en masse, never requested any action of the Commission either upon the names en masse (which probably would not have been considered) or upon them individually, which certainly would have been.

A similar situation arose in Hymenoptera. There the so-called Erlangen list and other considerations threatened a grand stirring around of family names. The undersigned prepared a series of petitions to the Commission, each covering a single name or series of interdependent names, some involved in the Erlangen list, others not involved. He sent copies to all working hymenopterists known to him and asked them either to sign or to indicate their disapproval. These petitions, with signatures and comments, were presented to the Commission, have all been acted upon, have all but one been granted by the Commission, and as a result we have available for use the family names in Hymenoptera that the usage of the 19th Century established. Blame for the fact that dipterists are not as well off cannot be fairly laid to the Commission.

J. CHESTER BRADLEY
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Successful Interchange of Ovaries Between Albino Rats and Mice

The present note deals with transplantation of entire rat ovaries into mice and vice versa. Each ovary was "shelled out" of the ovarian bursa, removed intact, and inserted into a corresponding location in the recipient. Excised ovaries were simply exchanged between adult rat and adult mouse. Both unilateral and bilateral implants were made. Approximately seven weeks later the transplants and (when present) the original undisturbed ovary of the opposite side were examined histologically. All implants had persisted, and all had an excellent blood supply. In several of the rat ovaries which had been implanted into mice there was regression, although some contained developing follicles in various stages. Some of the mouse ovaries, which had been implanted into rats appeared cystic, as from overstimulation. It is suggested that the large mass of adult rat ovarian tissue is insufficiently stimulated by the mouse pituitary, while the rat pituitary overstimulated the relatively smaller adult mouse ovaries.

One rat delivered a normal litter of seven young 18 days after receiving two mouse ovaries in substitution for her own. She failed to lactate. One mouse which received a unilateral substitution had a litter of seven apparently normal young 12 days later and also failed to lactate. Experiments are being continued.

JAMES M. SANDERS
Department of Anatomy, University of Missouri, and *Department of Science, Chicago Teachers College*

Lomonósov and the Concept of Heat

My attention has been called to an article (*Science,* 1945, **103**, 487) in which the author feels that insufficient tribute has been paid to M. V. Lomonósov and states that his name has never been mentioned in the European and the American scientific literature in connection with the development of our concept of heat.