Personal Memo from
JOSHUA LEDERBERG

p 266 N. Z.

JAN - 7 1987

Lack in gene order?

Dear Norton -

As usual you have an astute insight, and your point is well taken. I am pleased and impressed that the first (1947) linear map fits on today's master charts. But of course you are right that the canonical point of entry is arbitrarily related to a given Hfr. I have some possibly defective recall (my? François'? experiments) that 58-161 behaves overall rather like Hfr_{H1} ... but it would be good to find some published data on time-of-entry experiments with this or other F^+. Do you know of any?

I also recall some (unsettled?) controversy with François whether the fertility of F^+ can be fully accounted for by (how stable?) integration of the F factor → Hfr. I doubted that, but it degenerates into the level of stability demanded.

I did think all the progeny of $F^+ \times F^-$ were F^+.

THE ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY NEW YORK 10021

Personal Memo from
JOSHUA LEDERBERG

There was certainly luck in the map, in the fairly close linkage of thr and leu; and as these were selected for, most of the recombinants in the 1947 crosses doubtless were examples where thr⁺ and leu⁺ had entered early.

I never said it wasn't complicated; and some day I mean to go back to these fundamentals -- and to postzygotic losses of segments that have already entered the F^-.

Thank you for making me think more carefully about it.

Yours,

J

orig. sent 1/7/87

THE ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY NEW YORK 10021