

9th May, 1956.

Dear Dr. Love,

I have looked at the proposals for International Rules of Genic Nomenclature and Symbolization, and have but few comments to make.

In Article 4, the several varian^{ts}~~ces~~ proposed indicate the existence of a real difficulty, such as usually occurs when different recognizable desiderata are brought into conflict, in this case the need for a universal unambiguous symbol, such as those used for the chemical elements, and a name, intelligible to those who speak a given language.

In chemistry there is distinction between the symbol, e.g. K, which is universal, and the name, which in English is 'potassium' (derived from the English words 'pot ash') though not so in other languages. The K indeed is derived from 'Kaliun', which is, I believe, latinized arabic. I believe the conflict as presented by the alternatives of Article 4 will not be resolved unless we make a similar distinction.

This I have done for many years in the designation of new genes of mice in my own department. For example the X-ray

induced mutant of circling type obtained and reported by Professor P. Hertwig was named by her, in German, 'kreisler' and assigned the symbol kr. In my view, the symbol should be taken as universal, and used by English and ^{for example} Japanese people alike, but the English name is properly 'Circler', and it is as pedantically inaccurate to call it 'kreisler' in an English article as it would be to call nitrogen 'stickstoff'.

without following the precedent set by chemistry, I think there is no hope of a satisfactory alternative to Article 4, for ^{them} ~~there~~ is no need to ^{select} ~~make~~ a panel of acceptable languages; ^{even} if one speaks basque, one can translate any name one pleases into basque, and use the symbol for international identification. I believe it is recognized as no inconvenience to Chinese, Japanese, and Russian writers to use international symbols in Roman type.

Sincerely yours,