


ISTITUTO



MILANESE

24.xi.52

Dear Joshua,

This letter need not alter the regular sequence of correspondence. I have nothing special to report on laboratory work, at least nothing ^{with} ~~at~~ which I am really satisfied. I received on Saturday your letter concerning the proofs, which rather astonished me because I had not yet received the proofs. A few hours later the proofs came; they had been delayed in the mails because the Editor sent them to the address given in the paper, which is not sufficient. However, I knew the proofs were coming because Hayes had wired me—and added that no corrections of text were allowed. I sent him nevertheless the enclosed list of corrections, which were reduced so as not to alter the ~~xxxxxx~~ paper to a considerable extent from a typographical point of view and wired him back to wait, before sending the proofs back, in order to be sure that my list had reached him. It was very good inspiration to send back your proofs as well with the correction of the misprint in title, because this is the kind of error which most easily escapes attention, and if Hayes overlooked it, the Editor will in any case be aware of it. I shall let you know further news as soon as they come.

I hope you approve the enclosed corrections; they represent the interpretation of what you wrote me.

Yours

Luca.

LIST OF CORRECTIONS TO JGM PAPER

Pages refer to yellow manuscript in my hands.

p.6, lines 19-22, delete sentence : "Aeration was carried out either by rolling the tubes (Milan) or by bubbling air thorough the medium ".

p.6 line 18, insert : "(by rolling)" after the word "aeration".

p.9 line 12. Instead of "enzyme inhibitors(...)", write : "inhibitors of enzymes(....)".

~~p.10, lines 9-10. Instead of "perhaps more important", write~~
~~p.12, lines 13-21~~

p.12, lines 13-21 (given as lines 21-29 page 9 of the manuscript in Lederberg's hands). Lederberg believes this is too near the American version and should be possibly paraphrased. Have you any suggestions which would not alter the number of lines?

p.19 line 22. Instead of "prototrophs" write "zygotes".

p.20, lines 2-3. Instead of: (assuming this as the physical basis of the observed exchanges), write : (assuming this is the basis of the observed genetic exchanges). This should not alter the following lines.

p.22, line 16. Instead of "strain 977;" write: "strain W 945" .

p.22, line 17. Instead of: "S-Hal-Xyl-Gal-Lac-Ara-TL-" write : "S-Hal-Xyl-Gal-Lac-(Ara-TL)."

p.24 line 17. Instead of : "Nuclearcut exception has been found to the rule that," write : "Hfr forms an apparent exception to the rule that,". ~~ix~~

p.24 line 19. Instead of : "This would mean" write : "This rule would mean".

Note.: in the transformation ~~thus~~ suggested, ^{for page 24.} the room gained in the first line is exactly correspondent to that lost by adding the word "rule" in the third line, so that only the first three lines of this paragraph need be rewritten.

p.27, last PAR. I can here suggest two alternatives, a more drastic one and a less drastic. The more drastic might alter the number of pages and therefore may have to be discarded on this ground.

According to the less drastic alteration, the following corrections should be made :

p.27, line 15. Instead of : ~~xxxxxxx~~ "Two hypotheses, based on " write : "At least one hypothesis, based on".

p.27 line 16-17: delete sentence: "the first is that".

p.27, line 19. Instead of: "There is at present no evidence to" write: "There is at present no definite evidence to".

p.27, last three lines; delete all the text after the word "reduction", which will therefore terminate this paragraph.

p.28 delete first two lines.

p.28 line 3, Instead of "The second hypothesis would suppose" write: "Another possibility is that there is". The new sentence has the same length as the old one.

p.28, lines 13-16. Instead of " This second hypothesis, however, etc". Write: "This interpretation however does not agree well with some features of the data in table 2, which need not be discussed in this place, so that, at the moment, the hypothesis of segmental elimination remains the more attractive.

The more drastic alteration has in common with the first the correction of the last par. of page 27. I rewrite here for clarity this paragraph, as it should look like after correction:

"As to the effects of F+ on segregation, it is obvious that further analyses of linearity of the chromosome (the physical basis of the linkage group) in Bact. coli K-12 will have to take them into consideration. At least one hypothesis, based on Mendelian theory, can be put forward to account for them: the elimination of a specific segment of the chromosome contributed by the F+ parent may take place regularly at every fertilisation. There is at present no definite evidence to suggest whether such elimination might occur during formation of the F+ gametic cell, during fertilisation, or at the ensuing reduction."

With the more drastic alteration, this paragraph would end the paper and all the rest would be deleted.

With the exception of the correction at page 6, which alters the number of lines and may be impossible at page-proof stage, and the corrections of the last two paragraphs which are somewhat extensive but ~~should not have any consequences~~ being the last ones, all the corrections given should not alter the number of lines or the lines coming after the text which has been corrected so that there should be no great difficulty experienced in incorporating them into text.