First, sibling embryos *a, b, c, d* and *e* were put up in culture at a stage comparable with a stage 19 chick. *a* was cultured for 11 days at 4° C. and 1 day at room temperature (21°–23° C.), and showed no appreciable development: whereas *b*, cultured for 13 days at room temperature, reached the equivalent chick stage 27: *c* and *d* were both cultured for 21 days; *c* was kept at room temperature throughout, but *d* was kept for the first 11 days at 4° C. and then transferred to room temperature: *c* and *d* reached equivalent chick stages of 34 (8 days) and 26 (5 days) respectively: *e*, cultured at room temperature for 40 days, was fixed just before hatching.

Secondly, sibling embryos *f, g, h, i, j* and *k* were put up at a stage comparable with chick stage 21: *f, g* and *h*, cultured for 9, 23 and 30 days respectively at room temperature, reached equivalent chick stages of 29, 36 and 38: *i* showed no appreciable development after 9 days at 4° C., and *j*, also at 4° C., only reached the equivalent chick stage of 22 after as long as 23 days. On the other hand, *k* reached the equivalent chick stage of 34 after only 8 days of culture at 30° C.

Comparable results were obtained with several other batches of embryos. The 10 embryos kept for some period at 30° C. all showed accelerated development. Conversely, 20 embryos showed an almost complete arrest of development while they were kept at 4° C., although they survived at this temperature for periods of up to 29 days. When some embryos were transferred to room temperature apparently normal development ensued. This finding may have practical significance, since it suggests that large numbers of embryos can be stored at a minimal rate of development until it is convenient to operate on them.

It was found both by Panigel and ourselves that even in embryos kept at room temperature there was considerable mortality around the time of hatching, although up to this point few deaths occurred. None of our embryos kept at 30° C. succeeded in hatching, although some reached near-hatching stages. A few embryos were also kept at 33°–35° C. These failed to survive for longer than about 10 days, but with more stringent precautions against dehydration longer survival might have been obtained.

Operations involving the cutting off of a portion of tail with fine scissors, after making a small cut in the thin shell membrane and underlying embryonic membranes, were carried out on 16 embryos kept at room temperature. These embryos were all at a comparatively late stage of development equivalent to chick stages of 23 (4 days) or later. Only 2 embryos died as an apparent direct result of the operation, the remainder being fixed 5–27 days afterwards. Some of these prolapsed through the rent in their membranes, which appeared to form adhesions with the surface of the body.

In certain cases the results of the operation were difficult to interpret and the tissues near the lesion were disorganized. In other embryos no such complications ensued. None of the embryos showed any obvious signs of tail regeneration although the wound had healed. In some, however, histological examination revealed certain features suggestive of those described in early tail regenerates of geckos by Hughes and New³. The apparent lack of tail regeneration in our specimens is of interest and deserves further investigation. It may have been due simply to inadequate survival time, but there are other possible explanations; for example, the power of tail regeneration so characteristic of the adult may not develop until post-natal life.

It was also found possible to culture the eggs of the slow-worm (*Anguis fragilis*), another viviparous species⁴. Temperatures of about 18° C. seemed to be most suitable for their maintenance. Removal of part of the tail was also carried out on 3 late slow-worm embryos; these showed no obvious external signs of regeneration a month after the operation but have not yet been studied histologically.

These observations suggest that Panigel's technique offers a new approach to the problems of experimenting on reptile embryos, and particularly to the study of morphogenesis and regeneration during the later stages of development.

P. F. A. MADERSON
A. D'A. BELLAIRS

St. Mary's Hospital Medical School,
London, W.2.

¹ Panigel, M., *Ann. Sci. Nat. (Zool.)*, **18**, 509 (1956).

² Hamilton, H. L., *Lillie's Development of the Chick*, third ed. (Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1952).

³ Hughes, A., and New, D., *J. Embryol. Exp. Morph.*, **7**, 281 (1959).

⁴ Raynaud, A., *C.R. Acad. Sci., Paris*, **249**, 1715 (1959), describes a more elaborate technique.

Bivalved Gastropod from Jamaica

THE bivalved gastropod *Berthelinia* Crosse (= *Tamanovalva* Kawaguti and Baba) has been reported from Japan¹, Australia², and California³. A second genus, *Midorigai* Burn, has been described from Australia. The purpose of this communication is to record *Berthelinia* from Jamaica. The first specimen was found on *Caulerpa verticillata* Agardh growing on rocks in an open part of a mangrove channel near Port Royal on January 8, 1962. Small quantities of algae collected on January 11 and 16 yielded fifty more specimens, so in this small area *Berthelinia* can be described as common. To my knowledge, this is the first time that living bivalved gastropods have been taken from the Atlantic.

The shell is almost identical with that of *B. typica* Gatliff and Gabriel⁴. The present species certainly belongs to this genus, although further work is necessary to decide whether or not it is distinct from those species already described.

I thank Prof. D. M. Steven and the staff of the Department of Zoology, University College of the West Indies, for provision of laboratory facilities, and the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research and the Committee for Commonwealth University Interchange for funds while in Jamaica.

MALCOLM EDMUNDS

Department of Zoology,
University Museum, Oxford.

¹ Cox, L. R., and Rees, W. J., *Nature*, **185**, 749 (1960).

² Burn, R., *Nature*, **186**, 179 (1960).

³ Keen, A. M., *Nature*, **188**, 406 (1960).

⁴ Burn, R., *Nature*, **187**, 44 (1960).

Occurrence of *Cystoseira tamariscifolia* (Huds.) Papenf. on the West Coast of Scotland

Cystoseira tamariscifolia (Huds.) Papenf. is generally regarded as characteristic of warmer seas, being particularly abundant on the Atlantic shores of Europe and North Africa and in the Mediterranean¹. In the British Isles it is frequent on the south-west of England and on the south and west coasts of Ireland², extending on occasion to Co. Donegal³ and Co. Antrim⁴. It has rarely been recorded from Scotland: early records exist from the coasts of Ayrshire and