NOTES AND NEWS

Nomenclature

D. R. Charles Translocations In glancing again over Muller's "Rearrangements" note in DIS:2, I can not help feeling that his symbols are a bit too compact, at least for people who are not working a good deal of the time with translocations. But some symbology is certainly needed and Kaliss and I are using a basis for nomenclature which is pretty well shown by the symbol for T,3-4c: 3L•cu; 3R cu•4. (a) where more than one chromosome is involved in the rearrangement, the resulting elements are arranged in order of the spindle fiber to which they are attached - here 3L•cu has the third sf, 3R cu•4, the fourth; (b) as with Muller, the dot indicates a rearrangement point and where possible, in each part of the broken chromosome is shown the known locus (in that part) which is nearest the rearrangement point; (c) no cumbersome and confusing arrows are needed: had, for instance the right end of the 3 been attached to 4 in T3,4 it would have been written •cu 3R•4. Here are examples: Dobzhansky's (1932) Genetics 17: 369-92 translocation would be: 2R vg•B 1R; 2L cu•f 1L; Van Atta's (1932 Genetics 17:637-59) Dilute-1 would be: •pr 2R•2L b, which says "this chromosome starts to the left of pr, goes to the right end of 2, continues thru the left end of 2 to b." ClB would be: 1L ec•sy bi•fu 1R.

H. J. Muller Nomenclature of alleles. It is evident that the nomenclature proposed for alleles, involving the date of discovery, too cumbersome ordinarily to be used in formulae, and that in practice, after the first definition, an abbreviation would be employed so that the first abbreviation would have purposes only of reference. This being the case, the abbreviational character of the first symbol becomes of minor importance. Since there seems no interest in itself attaching to the exact date of discovery of a mutation, and even the record of that may, for this reason, not have been kept, different investigators having different methods of work and laying emphasis on different aspects of their investigations, it may be questioned whether it would not be better to let each investigator, or group of investigators, list their own mutations: for example, numbering them as they wish, and giving them the name of the investigator or group. The latter name can usually be abbreviated to one or two letters. In this way it would be more easily evident to whom a person interested in a given allelomorph should turn, if he wishes more information concerning it, and the abbreviation might well be kept within reasonable limits of size in most cases. In proposing this, however, we do not wish to give the impression that we consider it important to know who the original finder of a given mutatuion was. The finding may have been made as a purely routine matter or an assigned problem, by a technical assistant or a student. The planning of the tests of the mutation (localization, etc.) and the interpretation of the results may have been the work of a second person, and the actual manipulations may have been carried out by a third, or even by several in cooperation if the case were complicated, while still another might have made up the final stock. In such cases, names have little meaning, except in so far as it may at some time be useful to be able to consult the director or directors of such work.