

November 3, 1938

Dear Dr Nabours,

As you know, I have been intending for some time to get published some of the calculations I carried out on receiving the counts obtained in the Nabours Sabrosky expedition of 1933, and in the first place to discuss the situation revealed in Paratettix texanus and Apotettix eurycephalus.

On the large typed sheet you sent me, headed Records on Paratettix texanus (Nabours-Sabrosky Tetrigid Expedition, Summer of 1933) giving the classification of six large samples, there are a few points which I should be glad to clear up before publishing final calculations. These may well be due to mis-typing, or any other source of misunderstanding. I should be much obliged if you could either have these checked at once from the original records, or let me know that this cannot be done at once, in which case I will proceed without waiting, for the doubts affect only a few insects, and cannot possibly influence any general conclusion.

(a) The sample taken at Kerrville, Texas, on July 14th has, in my copy, some discrepancies in the totals. The total shown on your sheet is one too many - 193 against 192 for long-winged males, and 75 against 74 for long-winged females - with corresponding discrepancy in the total, which shows 297, whereas the component figures only add to 295. It is possible that some genotype scoring in these classes 1 1 2 has been omitted from my typescript.

(b) I assume that the symbols Cof, Hm and Hn stand for single factors, different from those designated by single letters, as is N₁ from N and, I presume Sf from S. In my typescript Sf is reduplicated, as if the one insect so designated, a long-winged female from Topila, were known to be homozygous. This, of course, may be a typing error, representing the fact that this insect showed a character designated by Sf. There were, however, two insects from Topila and one from Tamos designated Sf Sf sap, which, from their position in the table among the single dominants, might be taken as an abbreviated description of the single factor, though, otherwise, I should expect it to mean a compound involving both Sf Sf and some recognisable, but separable, indication represented by sap.

Finally, there is one insect from Tamos designated by Dmsap, which is placed among the D compounds, although

m and msap do not appear among the single factors.

Of course I understand that in a collection of several thousand insects one may expect that some will be found whose genetic constitution is not clear from the specimen, and these I must deal with as best I can. It is probable, of course, that you ^{can} could let me know at once whether any of these designations have been mistyped, and what the provisional interpretation was that was placed upon these specimens.

In Apotettix eurycephalus I assume that Cob and Yob stand for single factors. I am not so clear about the fifth line, where there is a single insect Cp pr oo. There are also in this table 14 insects marked Bf Sf, the symbol which also puzzled me in Paratettix texanus, although Bf does not appear alone and does occur in three insects from Tampe in the compound Sf.

The chief importance of this small number of doubtful designations lies in the possibility that some of them may be intended to represent triple dominance^{to}. Apart from them/^{they} I believe ^{they} are completely absent from these two species when caught wild, and the fact is likely to be of some significance.

Yours sincerely,