

have mounted a batch of larvæ from the same host. If fungal growth proves troublesome, it may be kept down by a trace of merthiolate. This is preferably introduced after the larva has become akinetic. It, or a trace of formalin or spirit, may be introduced as a routine to the tube after removing the nymph if the larval pelts are to be kept indefinitely awaiting an opportunity to mount and study them. The comments of other workers who use this technique would be greatly appreciated.

J. R. AUDY
M. NADCHATRAM

Institute for Medical Research,
Kuala Lumpur,
Malaya.
Oct. 13.

Presence of a Peritrophic Membrane in Diplopods

The presence of a peritrophic membrane has been reported in the midgut of the following classes of mandibulate Arthropoda: Onychophora, Crustacea, Insecta and Chilopoda¹. It has not been reported in the Diplopoda, although Randow² stated that the brush border of the midgut epithelial cells may slough off. We have dissected tubular membranes giving a positive chitosan reaction³ from the midguts of the following British millipedes: *Tachypodoiulus niger*, *Ophyriulus pilosus*, *Iulus scandinavicus*, *Cylindroiulus punctatus* (Iulidae), *Glomeris marginata* (Glomeridae), *Polydesmus angustus* (Polydesmidae), *Polymerodon polydesmoides* (Craspedosomidae) and *Choneiulus palmatus* (Blaniulidae). The presence of a similar membrane has been inferred from paraffin sections of the midgut of *Polyxenus lagurus* (Polyxenidae). In none of these is there an oesophageal valve; it is therefore inferred that the peritrophic membrane arises by delamination of the brush border from the midgut epithelial cells. A delaminating brush border has been observed in *O. pilosus*, *C. punctatus*, *G. marginata*, *P. polydesmoides* and *C. palmatus*. Furthermore, in *G. marginata*, *P. angustus*, *T. niger*, *I. scandinavicus*, *C. punctatus* and *P. polydesmoides* concentric peritrophic membranes were seen in sections, a phenomenon often observed when membranes are formed by delamination⁴.

We wish to thank Mr. J. G. Blower for his help with identifications.

BETTY MASON
OWEN GILBERT

Merlewood Research Station,
Nature Conservancy,
Grange-over-Sands, Lancashire.
Aug. 27.

¹ Waterhouse, D. F., *Nature*, 172, 676 (1953).

² Randow, E., *Z. wiss. Zool.*, 122, 534 (1924).

³ Campbell, F. L., *Ann. Ent. Soc. Amer.*, 22, 401 (1929).

⁴ Wigglesworth, V. B., "The Principles of Insect Physiology" (Methuen, London, 1950).

Acceleration of Flowering in Non-vernalized Chrysanthemums by the Removal of Apical Sections of the Stem

Vince and Mason¹ have reported recently that unvernallized plants of *Chrysanthemum morifolium* var. Sunbeam can be induced to produce flowering lateral shoots by decapitation of the main shoot. Under the stated conditions the main apex did not bud for

a further four to six weeks. They suggest that inhibitory effects from the main apex are responsible for the failure of unvernallized plants to bud.

However, in variety Sunbeam it is in fact quite unnecessary for the main apex to be removed in order to obtain budded laterals. This observation was briefly mentioned in the paper referred to by Vince and Mason².

Flowering laterals in the presence of a vegetative main apex frequently appear on plants that have received a slight degree of vernalization. In a recent experiment, four out of four slightly vernalized plants, and twelve out of twenty-four incompletely devernallized plants which failed to bud with their main apices, produced flowering lateral shoots. The entirely unvernallized controls remained vegetative at lateral as well as main apices. A photograph of such plants accompanies a manuscript awaiting publication in the *Journal of Experimental Botany* dealing with the de-vernallization of the chrysanthemum.

As regards the theoretical interpretation of Vince and Mason's results, it may be mentioned that no evidence has been found for translocation of either positive or negative effects in grafting experiments between vernalized and unvernallized partners³.

W. W. SCHWABE

Research Institute of Plant Physiology,
Imperial College of Science and Technology,
London, S.W.7.

Nov. 4.

¹ Vince, D., and Mason, D. T., *Nature*, 174, 842 (1954).

² Schwabe, W. W., *J. Exp. Bot.*, 1, 329 (1950).

³ Schwabe, W. W., *J. Exp. Bot.* (in the press).

Zoological Nomenclature

NOTICE is hereby given that, as from April 22, 1955, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature will start to vote on the following cases involving the possible use of its plenary powers for the purpose specified against each entry. (1) Renier [1804] *Prospetto*; question of validation of four generic names (*Discoides*; *Cerebratulus*; *Polycitor*; *Scolixedon*) published in; (2) Renier [1807] *Tavola*; question of validation of six generic names (*Aglaja*; *Alcyonaria*; *Cystia*; *Rodens*; *Tuba*; *Tubulanus*) published in; (3) names (generic and specific) given to aptychi of Ammonites, suppression of; (4) *Notropis Rafinesque*, 1818 (Cl. Osteichthyes), determination of gender as masculine; (5) *Chelonicerus* Hyatt, 1903 (Cl. Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), designation of type species for; (6) *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761 (Cl. Gastropoda), retention of status for the purposes of the law of homonymy, to preserve *Lysandra* Hemming, 1933, from falling as a synonym of *Argus* Boisduval, 1832; (7) *minimus* Miller (J. S.), 1826 (*Belemnites*) (Cl. Cephalopoda, Order Dibranchia), validation of. A proposal for a 'Declaration' banning names based on aptychi of ammonites is also being made.

Full particulars of these cases appear in Part 9 of Volume 9 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*.

Comments on the above cases should be sent to me as soon as possible.

FRANCIS HEMMING
(Secretary)

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1.