

Monday.

26 February 1947

My dear Ron.

I am enclosing our paper *Lacertid*.  
I think it is now ready to go in, apart from  
the following:- The map (which I will supply  
shortly), the colour-plate - or else the Black &  
White figures - of the 3 forms, and the few  
small points I am now going to raise.

I have been carefully through it, and  
it seems ready for the press. I have corrected  
the wording here and there in the parts I wrote,  
and retyped one or two of my pages which had  
become rather confused owing to corrections or  
additions.

pp. 50-2 are of course the  
Summary, which I posted to you yesterday.  
You will see that I have added the references, as  
p. 53.

A reference to the papers of  
Dobzhansky and Timofeiff-Resnovsky, which you

so rightly suggested, seems to fit in on p. 49; but you may think it better elsewhere. Those to S. Wright's work rather obviously are appropriate at the top of p. 41. I have picked on 4, out of many, of his papers as fairly representing what he has to say; but I did not expend special care on this selection, for he has said the same thing so often that it does not seem very material which of his accounts one takes.

I thought it right to add the foot-note which you will find on p. 12. You see some specimens definitely state locality but not year. The date on which the collections containing them were received at e.g. the Hope Department is known; and, if prior to 1929, they could fairly be used to fill our small early records.

I have also added, for your consideration, the middle paragraph on p. 15;

That beginning "In the total sample---".  
 But if you think it better removed, please  
 cut it out. I do not think we had  
 pointed out how closely the number of  
himaecula captured approaches that expected from  
 the number of dominula and medionigra;  
 nor had I mentioned, that I am fairly  
 sure is true, that himaecula is less active  
 than the other two forms. That is not an  
 easy thing to express quantitatively, but is  
 yet very suggestive. Moreover, Kettlewell (a  
 very good entomologist, with much experience of  
dominula), is convinced of the same thing.

One point needs to be definitely  
 settled. Are we going to include the triangle  
 for 1946? I rather assume not and  
 throughout the paper we have numbered the  
 Tables so as to omit it. You had sent  
 it with the others and I return it. We have

I wrote my second paragraph on p. 4.

Several times (e.g. pp. 2, 20) said that we are not incorporating 1946 fully into this account, and I think we ~~are~~ both felt that was the right line; So 1946 is not included in the analysis on pp. 23 & 25, nor in Table 12 (p. 27) or Table 13 (p. 30). However, 1946 data are included in Table 14 (p. 33) and Table 15 (p. 35). Probably the right thing is to leave it - as it is - for we say we are not "fully" using these data: but do please adjust this if you think fit:

You will see I have altered "type" to "typical" on your p. 33 - a "type insect" having rather a technical meaning in Entomology.

The figures of the moths have been called Figs 1-4 (pp. 4 & 10). The map will be a figure (on p. 7). The numbering of these figures must, I think, now be left until it is certain whether or not the moths are to be shown on a Plate.

I hope all this is clear.

Yours sincerely,  
Henry.

P.S.

TELEPHONE 47726

DEPARTMENT OF  
ZOOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE ANATOMY,  
UNIVERSITY MUSEUM, OXFORD.

I have substituted your own excellent section-heading (from p. 41) in the table of contents on p. 1.

I don't know whether you feel that ~~Tables~~<sup>Tables</sup> 2-6 should each have separate descriptions. I have put these in at the bottom of each in pencil, & they can easily be rubbed out.

## JOHN INNES HORTICULTURAL INSTITUTION

MOSTYN ROAD, MERTON PARK, LONDON, S.W.19

From the Director, DR C. D. DARLINGTON. LIBerty 3645

26.11.47

My dear Ford

Oliver & Boyd would like you to have the colour photo made yourself since you are the best judge of the result. They say the negatives should be on a "good size of plate or film". You will recall I should like the reproduction to cover the whole sheet  $10" \times 6\frac{1}{4}"$  or preferably a little larger for bleeding. I am v. anxious to make a clean break with old-fashioned Science journal plates.

I hope you like my Russian Article. A fuller version was refused by Nature.

Yours ever  
C.D.D.