

February 21, 1942

Dear Mather,

Thanks for your letter. I am glad you are arranging for a Committee meeting on the 5th.

Your offer of duplicates, including some of Bateson's old papers, is extremely welcome. As you know, the Galton Lab. has always been exceedingly badly off for genetical material, and this applies especially to the productions - bad in quality as they were, - though most important historically - of the first 10 years of the century. Anything that you can send us will, therefore, be treasured. I should think K.F. must have made a private invitation of any genetical offprints sent to him personally.

I am glad of what you say about Lewis, that he is writing to me, and to hear also what you say yourself of some of these transitory situations being, perhaps for that reason, imperfectly adjusted. This seems to me a line of thought well worth exploring.

If you were to make a survey of the whole of some extensive, e.g.,

e.g. leguminosae, classifying each species as

- a) ^{apogamous} ~~hypogamous~~, or effectively asexual;
- b) Hermaphrodite, ^{and} ~~or~~ strictly self-fertilising;
- c) Hermaphrodite, ^{and} ~~or~~ normally outcrossing;
- d) Seldom or never self-fertilising owing to protandry, a self-sterilising factor, heterostyly, etc, and
- e) Dioecious;

would you get evidence that the central condition of hermaphroditism was so wide-spread, i.e. present in every taxonomic branch of the assemblage, and so common as reasonably to be thought present in all phylogenetic stems, and that both extreme conditions occurred sporadially only in isolated species, or groups of species? I do not know that anyone has systematically assembled the evidence from any considerable family or natural order. It seems to me most important for purposes of interpretation that this should be done, for, theoretically, it might be that one of the extreme conditions was more universally present in the ancestry, though continually throwing off side-shoots towards the other extreme.

Yours sincerely,