



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Telephone: 412-268-2434
Email: huntinst@andrew.cmu.edu
Web site: www.huntbotanical.org

The Hunt Institute is committed to making its collections accessible for research. We are pleased to offer this digitized item.

Usage guidelines

We have provided this low-resolution, digitized version for research purposes. To inquire about publishing any images from this item, please contact the Institute.

About the Institute

The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation, a research division of Carnegie Mellon University, specializes in the history of botany and all aspects of plant science and serves the international scientific community through research and documentation. To this end, the Institute acquires and maintains authoritative collections of books, plant images, manuscripts, portraits and data files, and provides publications and other modes of information service. The Institute meets the reference needs of botanists, biologists, historians, conservationists, librarians, bibliographers and the public at large, especially those concerned with any aspect of the North American flora.

Hunt Institute was dedicated in 1961 as the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, an international center for bibliographical research and service in the interests of botany and horticulture, as well as a center for the study of all aspects of the history of the plant sciences. By 1971 the Library's activities had so diversified that the name was changed to Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation. Growth in collections and research projects led to the establishment of four programmatic departments: Archives, Art, Bibliography and the Library.

1156 Keeler Ave.
Berkeley, Calif.
July 13, 1937

Mr. C. C. Deam,
Bluffton, Indiana

Dear Mr. Deam:

I have recently received a letter from Dr. Camp of the New York Botanical Garden telling me that you hope to finish the flora of Indiana this year. As you know I am working on the revision of the Umbelliferae for the North American Flora and in connection with that work I have checked over the manuscript on that family for several local floras. I should be pleased to assist in any way with the preparation of the manuscript on that family for your flora.

Six months ago I transferred my activities from the east to the west coast. I am now living in Berkeley and carrying on my studies of the umbels at the herbarium of the University of California. I find it a delightful place to work but woefully lacking in specimens of some of our common eastern Umbelliferae. If at any time you have duplicates of that family for distribution they would be greatly appreciated here.

This spring I had the opportunity to take several collecting trips in central coastal California and into western Nevada. I have found a number of the so-called rare umbels in quantity and been able to make field studies which have greatly abetted my work.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

1156 Euclid Ave.,
Berkeley, California
September 1, 1937

Dr. George T. Moore,
Missouri Botanical Garden,
St. Louis, Missouri

Dear Dr. Moore:

Enclosed is the requested paper for the Greenman edition of the Annals, late as usual. I had the best intentions of completing a paper on time for once but California seems to be a favorite visiting place for all my eastern friends and I have been forced to type in between sight-seeing trips and even have the visitors try their hand at proof-reading.

This numbering is not as good as it appears to be since the text is not continuous. I think when printed that it will be about the right length. I have cut it as much as possible, particularly by leaving out numerous citations of specimens.

My regards to the Garden staff and
to Mrs. Moore.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

1156 Keeler Ave.,
Berkeley, Calif.
September 10, 1957

Mr. C. C. Dean,
Bluffton, Indiana

Dear Mr. Dean:

Enclosed is the manuscript on Umbelliferae for the Flora of Indiana. I have made few changes, most of them being range extensions. We seem to agree upon the various species. I decided some time ago that the toothless leaf form of *Oxypolis rigidior* was only a chance variation and not worthy of a name. And if *Thaspium pinnatifidum* is a good species the name applies only to a few plants in North Carolina which seem to be distinct. However I want to see them in the field first.

The only correction I have made on the manuscript pages is in the key to the species of *Sanicula*. The other corrections are all made on the accompanying sheets. I have taken the liberty of suggesting a new key to the genera which combines the flowering and fruiting characters in one key. It will take up less space in publication. However you can use your own judgment about using it.

If there are any questions about my notes please let me know and if I can help you in any other way I shall be pleased to do so.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

1166 Keeler Ave.,
Berkeley, Calif.
October 12, 1937

Dr. H. A. Gleason,
New York Botanical Garden,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Gleason:

I have been asked to write you concerning the possibility of a New York Botanical Garden grant for study at the garden for Dr. G. N. Jones. I am in the somewhat awkward position of never having met Dr. Jones, not knowing whether or not he has written you applying for the grant, and knowing nothing of the garden's system of grants. Yet I felt that I should comply with the request.

The following information concerning Dr. Jones I have obtained from Dr. Constance, now at the University of California, who knows Dr. Jones personally and from Dr. C. L. Hitchcock, University of Washington. Dr. Jones is now at the Washington State Museum, University of Washington, Seattle. He received his doctorate in Botany from the University of Washington in 1937. He has also studied at Washington State College. He has been at the University of Washington for three years in charge of the herbarium and has done some teaching in taxonomy. He is reported to be a good teacher. He has collected widely in the state of Washington, some in the Willowa Mountains, Oregon and in Alaska. His publications include a revision of the roses of Washington, the moss flora of southeastern Washington, Grimmiaceae for Grout's Moss Flora, the flora of the Olympic Peninsula, Washington. He is now working on a revision of the Flora of the Northwest Coast and a Flora of Mt. Rainier. I am sorry that I do not have the exact citations for these publications at hand. Dr. Jones has a pleasing personality, although somewhat unconventional. However that is probably in his favor. He is probably in his middle thirties (consult the Barnhart file) and married. He is reported to have an interest and a general knowledge of nature study, to quote "darned good horse sense", a love of bibliography and a fairly good knowledge of the same, and a knowledge of detail and local flora, primarily of Washington.

Since all his work has been in Washington and he has had no opportunity of studying in eastern herbaria and has managed to accomplish a great deal with very limited resources of herbarium and library material, it is felt that a grant which would enable him to spend some time in the east at a larger institution would be of the utmost value to him and incidentally to those of us interested in the flora of the northwest coast since it would enable him to supplement his already wide field knowledge with studies of critical specimens.

Dr. Lincoln Constance and Dr. Hitchcock will both be glad to add to this information if you wish. And since they

know Mr. Jones personally they can undoubtedly give you much more information concerning his ability and experience.

The work on the Umbelliferae is coming along slowly. I am constantly delayed from writing manuscript by the identifications of numerous specimens and the checking of manuscripts on the family for various local floras. Yet I feel that I cannot say no to such requests since one of the important factors in the study of the family is the examination of as many specimens as possible so that I can have a better idea of the variations that occur within species and genera. I have completed the genus *Cogswellia*, probably the largest in the flora, and it is now in press in the Missouri Botanical Garden Annals. There were several new species, varieties and combinations as well as certain notes which I wished to publish before the publication of the North American Flora number.

I am enjoying more and more the University atmosphere and the Berkeley climate. I now have the title of Research Associate at the University, no salary and no duties but it gives me library privileges and such. I take time out each week to attend a graduate seminar in floral morphology and anatomy which I am finding most interesting and instructive. I have been very fortunate in having many opportunities for field studies of some of my little known species and find that a day in the field will solve some of the problems I have worried over in the herbarium for years. The herbarium collections here are fairly adequate except for Mexican and Central American material although they do have many of the Pringle collections. There is also surprisingly little of some of the common eastern species but fortunately I know most of them adequately. Then too I can readily consult Jepson's unparalleled collections of California umbels. That is, I can consult them when Dr. Jepson is here to unlock the cases. Now that he has retired it is sometimes difficult to catch him in his office.

With regards to Mrs. Gleason and to my various garden friends, I am

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

4004 Life Sciences Bldg.
University of California
Berkeley, California
January 9, 1938

Mr. J. W. Thompson
2921 22nd Avenue South
Seattle, Washington

Dear. Mr. Thompson:

The following are the determinations of your
1937 collection of Umbelliferae:

- 14070 *Pteryxia terebinthina* var. *calcareae* (Jones)
Mathias
13848 *Pteryxia terebinthina* var. *foeniculiacea*
(Nutt.) Mathias
14092 *Osmorhiza occidentalis* (Nutt.) Torr.
13751 *Cymopterus* (*Aulospermum*) *glaucus* Nutt.
14170 *Perideridia* (*Carum*) *Gairaneri* (Hook. & Arn.)
Mathias
13898 *Ligusticum Grayi* Coult. & Rose
14097 *Sphenosciadium capitellatum* Gray
14166 *Siium suave* Walt.
14029 *Osmorhiza nuda* Torr.
14028 *Angelica Lyallii* Wats.

As soon as I find time to complete the labelling
of your other Umbelliferae I shall return them to you.
I am certainly grateful for the opportunity of examining
these many valuable specimens.

I have recently published a new variety from the
state of Washington which I have taken the liberty to name
in honor of you for the valuable contributions which you
have made in your numerous collections from that state.
The variety is *Lomatium Suksdorfii* var. *Thompsonii* Mathias.
The type is the only specimen I have seen in mature condition,
Sandberg and Leiberg 489. However your numbers 5909 and
9000 are this variety. As soon as reprints are available
I shall see that one is sent to you.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

4004 Life Sciences Bldg.,
University of California
Berkeley, California
February 23, 1938

Mr. J. W. Thompson,
2921 22nd Avenue South
Seattle, Washington

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The following are the determinations of the 1937
collections:

Milburge 1391 *Osmorhiza brevipes* (C. & R.) Suksdorf
Thompson 14250 *Angelica Canbyi* Coult. & Rose
14235 *Pteryxia terebinthina* var. *foeniculacea*
(Nutt.) Mathias
14211 *Ecnatiium angustatum* var. *flavum* G. W. Jones
15713 *Leptotaenia multifida* Nutt.

I believe this completes the list of determinations
for the 1937 collection. If I have omitted any of them please
inform me. I hope to complete the labelling of your mounted
specimens soon and return them to you.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

4004 Life Sciences Bldg.,
University of California,
Berkeley, California
February 14, 1938

Mr. J. A. Trent,
State Teachers College,
Pittsburg, Kansas

Dear Mr. Trent:

Your postcard of January 26th was referred to me for reply shortly before I received your letter of February 7th. I assume that by *Eryngium yuccaefolium* you mean the plant with parallel-veined leaves and not the true *E. aquaticum* of the eastern seacoast. I am sorry I have not a complete distribution map of the species but the following data may be of use to you although in many cases I have not checked on the counties and have only the names of the towns. Unless otherwise stated these specimens are in the U. S. National Herbarium.

Conn.: naturalized in a dry field near Bridgeport, James
N. J.: Elberon, Hall 511
Md.: Montgomery Co., Wherry; Cabin John (on the Potomac
River just above Washington, D. C.), Shoemaker
Va.: Prince Edward Co., Smith; Pittsylvania Co., Heller
1104
N. C.: Statesville, Hyams; Biltmore, Biltmore Herb. 414b;
Cullowhee, Thaxter; Catawba Co., Small 60; Polk Co., Townsend
S. C. Oconee Co., House 2898; Caesar's Head, Smith
Ge.: Meriwether Co., Harper 1270; Lookout Mt., Ruth 424;
Rome, Chapman
Fla.: Brevard Co., Fredholm 5660
Ala.: Lee Co., Earle, Pollard; Westfowl River (probably
near Mobile), Mohr; Erin, Howell 694; Mobile, Mohr
Miss.: Jackson Co., Pollard 1018; Harrison Co., Pollard
1043
La.: Alexandria, Ball 632, Covington, Arsene 11667
Ohio: Oxford prairie, Erie Co., Moseley; Painesville,
Beardslee (Herb. Oberlin Coll.).
Ind.: Clarke, Umbach; Lake Maxienkuckee, Evermann 845
(Mr. C. C. Deam, Bluffton, Indiana, who is completing
a flora of that state can give you the complete distribution
for the state.)
Wisc.: Washburn Co. (probably adventive), Dane, Green,
and Rock Counties, Grant or Crawford Co., Grant or Lafayette Co.
and Milwaukee Co. (latter coll. by Lapham whose labels can not
be trusted) All information from Dr. Fassett, Univ. of Wisc.
Ill.: Champaign Co., Rose; Morgan Park Ridge, Dixon 780;
Vermilion Co., Gates 214; Stark Co., Chase 1547; Peoria,
Brandel; Chicago, Gates; Jackson Co., French

Tenn.: Cumberland Co., Coffman 247; Knoxville, Bain;
 Lookout Mt., Ward
 Minn.: Nicollet Co., Ballard; Cannon City, Mearns;
 Winona (?), Holzinger
 Iowa: Grinnell, Jones; Fayette Co., Fink 188
 Mo.: Springfield, Standley 8578, Mansfield, Lansing 3172
 (Dr. Julian Steyermark, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago
 can probably give you the most complete records for this state)
 Ark.: Vernon Co., McAtee 3044; Little Rock, Demaree 8236;
 Pope Co., Palmer 8167
 Kan.: Pottawatomie Co., Haller 702, Hitchcock 702a;
 Natl. Military Home (1894), Ballard; Osage, Crevecoeur 28
 Okla.: On False Washita between Fort Cobb and Fort
 Arbuckle, Palmer 147; Osage Co., Stevens 1971; Choctaw Co.,
Palmer 9007.
 Texas: Seabrook, Fisher 2017; Hallettsville, Fisher 85;
 Port Arthur, Porter (Mr. V. L. Cory, Texas Agricultural Experi-
 ment Station, Sonora, Texas, coauthor of a recent catalogue of
 the Flora of Texas can undoubtedly give you a complete list of
 counties in that state.)

I hope that this far from complete list may be of some
 help to you. This species happens to be one of many where my
 distribution list is based primarily upon material in one
 herbarium since I am more interested in the limits of range
 than in a record of each locality. As far as I know the species
 does not occur outside of the United States and occupies the
 range typical of so many species from the southeastern coast
 around the Gulf coast and extending inland up the river courses.
 I shall be very much interested in having any information which
 you may compile concerning this species and if I obtain any
 new records I shall send them to you.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

4004 Life Sciences Bldg.
University of California
Berkeley, California
February 23, 1938

Professor Morton E. Peck,
Willamette University,
Salem, Oregon

Dear Professor Peck: •

I was very much interested and pleased with your comments concerning Lomatium Nelsonianum since they confirmed my suspicions that the type sheet contained a mixture of material. If you ever receive any material of that species showing good foliage I should like very much to see it so that an accurate description of the foliage may be published.

The specimen which you sent me January 24th which you believed might be L. Drummondii is L. Donnellii Coult. & Rose. Unfortunately I do not have a record of the number with me but I hope that the above description will be sufficient to place it.

The following are the determinations of the earlier loan:

19650	<i>Sanicula nevadensis</i> Wats.
18408	<i>Pteryxia terebinthina</i> var. <i>foeniculacea</i> (Nutt.) Mathias
19396	<i>Lomatium Donnellii</i> Coult. & Rose
18913	<i>L. MacDougali</i> Coult. & Rose
15213	<i>Lomatium</i> sp.

Were these specimens to be returned to you? Number 15213 I have not been able to place in any described species of Lomatium. If you have more material of it I should like to see it as it may prove to be an undescribed species.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

1156 Keeler Avenue,
Berkeley, California
February 23, 1938

Mr. T. H. Kearney,
Bureau of Plant Industry,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Kearney:

The material which you sent for determination was returned to you several days ago. The following are the identifications:

- 13689 *Pseudocymopterus montanus* (Gray) C. & R.
13309 *Lomatium MacDougali* Coult. & Rose (You will notice that I have again changed my mind concerning the status of this species. And the use of the name *Lomatium* has been more or less forced upon me by editorial opinion.)
13550 *Cymopterus Fendleri* Gray.
13489 *C. purpureus* Wats.
13415 *C. purpureus* Wats.
13394 *C. Newberryi* (Wats.) Jones
13373 *C. Newberryi* (Wats.) Jones
13352 *C. Newberryi* (Wats.) Jones
13154 *Caucalis microcarpa* H. & A.

Any duplicate specimens of these species, or for that matter of any Arizona Umbelliferae, will be welcome additions to the collections here. Do you have any duplicate material of *Ammoselinum giganteum*? I am trying to determine the status of the Californian species described by Munz and Johnston and I need more adequate material of the Arizona species.

I hope to get around to the manuscript for the flora soon. I have received the list of species and the sample descriptions which you sent some time ago.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

4004 Life Sciences Bldg.,
University of California,
Berkeley, California
February 23, 1938

Mr. Ira W. Clokey,
1635 Laurel Street,
South Pasadena, California

Dear Mr. Clokey:

I had made no plans for the publication of the new species of *Angelica* so I am drawing up a description which I shall send to you within a few days. I have decided to describe the plant as a new species. I have had some difficulty finding an appropriate specific name since the genus is such a large one that practically all the descriptive names have already been used. For the present I am using the name *Angelica scabrida* in reference to the scabrous roughening of the inflorescence. If you have any other suggestions for a name I shall be glad to know of them.

I should also like the following information to incorporate in the description and notes - any additional habitat data which you have not already sent me; the size of the plant (height); the division of the basal leaves (I assume that the specimens are only a portion of the leaf) - are they ternately compound, ternate-pinnate or what; the type of root; and any other information which you think may be pertinent.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

4004 Life Sciences Bldg.,
University of California
Berkeley, California
3 March 1938

Mr. I. W. Clokey
1635 Laurel Street,
South Pasadena, California

Dear Mr. Clokey:

Enclosed is the manuscript for Angolicea scabrata.
If you wish to make any changes or additions please feel
free to do so. If you have the citation for the Jaeger
collection it might well be added. I believe that I saw
a specimen of his collection at Pomona College some years
ago but I do not have the exact citation for it, only a
note that it was apparently close to A. tomentosa.

If it is too late to get this included in your
paper I am sure that it could be published shortly in
the Leaflets of Western Botany.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

Department of Botany
University of California
Berkeley, California
March 4, 1938

Dr. P. A. Munz,
Pomona College,
Claremont, California

Dear Dr. Munz:

I am returning today the specimens of Umbelliferae which I borrowed for study last summer. There are 128 specimens in this lot. One specimen, the type of Ammoselinum occidentale, I am retaining for further study when I receive specimens of A. giganteum from the east. I doubt if Jepson is correct in considering them synonyms but I want to compare the two types to be certain.

Under separate cover I am sending a reprint of the Lomatium paper. It's a great relief to have that done but already I have collected material from various sources which may prove to be a new species. My work goes slowly. For the past month I have done nothing but write labels. Fortunately we have WPA help to do the pasting but even the writing takes too much time.

We see little of the Beadles and Palo Alto might be as far removed as Cambridge. We did manage a Sunday there in January inspecting their house and laboratory.

I hope to have a few days at Pomona sometime this spring and summer to look over the Jones collections of other genera than Lomatium. This time I hope you won't be rushing off to the field so we can get reacquainted. Many thanks for the loan of these specimens and I hope they get through the floods safely. Our papers lead us to believe that southern California is mostly washed out to sea.

Sincerely,

Department of Botany,
University of California
Berkeley, California
March 5, 1938

Mr. J. H. Christ,
Soil Conservation Service,
109 West Third Street,
Moscow, Idaho

Dear Mr. Christ:

I should like very much to see your specimens of Umbelliferae. The Idaho flora is not as well known as it might be and the more collections I see from that state the better understanding I can have of some of the problems of distribution and relationship.

Dr. Constance, formerly at Washington State College, asks me to transmit his regards and to make the request that when convenient you send him your material of the Hydrophyllaceae. At present he is particularly interested in the genus *Nemophila*. He and I recently had the opportunity of going over the collections of these two families which Dr. Davis of Pocatello has made in southern Idaho.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

4004 Life Science Bldg.,
University of California,
Berkeley, California
7 March 1938

Mr. I. W. Clokey,
1635 Laurel Street,
South Pasadena, California

Dear Mr. Clokey:

Enclosed are two labels for number 5548. One label I had mounted with the specimen I designated as the type.

I can well understand your wish to have the sheet of number 5548 in your herbarium designated as the type sheet of the species. However I feel that the type specimen should be the one in the herbarium here since the description was drawn from it and the two or three other sheets which I kept to show the range of variation. Since I do not keep my own herbarium - a practical impossibility when one moves around the country as much as I do - I have already given my specimens I receive to the institution where I am working at the moment unless they duplicate other collections. And I have made it a point to have the types of new species or varieties deposited in some large institutional herbarium. In most cases they are more available not only at present but for the future in such an herbarium than in a private collection. And even though a number of isotypes are distributed the actual type sheet which the author had at hand when describing the species is the only sheet of historical value.

If the species is to be illustrated - an excellent idea - the photograph should be of the type sheet. I can have one made of the specimen here, if you decide to use it as the type, and send it to you by the end of the week if you wish to use it. If you happened to take a photograph of the plants in the field that would also make a valuable plate.

I will be very grateful if you will order an extra fifty reprints, with covers, for me and send them express collect or charge me for the postage with the printing charges. I will appreciate it since I realize that by ordering them in large number there is quite a saving in price.

With many thanks for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

April 29, 1938

Dr. C. L. Lundell,
University Herbarium,
University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dear Dr. Lundell:

Dr. Epling has told me that you have been sending him some very interesting material of Labiatae collected for you by a native collector in Mexico. I should be very much interested in seeing any material of the Umbelliferae from Mexico. As you may know I am completing a revision of that family for the North American Flora and the Mexican and Central American genera are particularly puzzling since they are poorly represented in our collections. Consequently any additional material from those regions which I may study will be of great value in a more adequate understanding of the group.

Very truly yours,

Mildred E. Mathias,
Research Associate in Botany

29 April 1938

Mr. C. C. Gregg,
Field Museum of Natural History,
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Mr. Gregg:

The packet of seeds of Umbelliferae which you sent me some time ago for identification contains a mixture of material. The seeds with the solitary oil tubes and very narrow lateral wings are morphologically identical with those of Anethum graveolens, the dill, and I suspect that their clove-like odor and taste may be a contamination. The seeds with the several oil tubes in the intervals and the slightly broader lateral wings are possibly a species of Peucedanum but I have not been able to match them with any material I have available. More adequate material would be necessary in both cases to be positive of the identifications. As far as I know there is no record of an umbellifer seed with a clove-like taste and odor.

Very truly yours,

Mildred E. Mathias,
Research Associate in Botany

April 29, 1938

Mr. G. B. Hinton,
Edificio Ermita,
Tacubaya, D. F.
Mexico

Dear Mr. Hinton:

Dr. Epling has told me that he is buying a set of Labiatae from you and sending you names for the specimens. We would be very much interested in the same arrangement for the Umbelliferae and the Polemoniaceae and anything you may collect in the Potentillae. Dr. Mason and Miss Cram are studying the latter groups while I have been working on the Umbelliferae for the North American Flora revision for some years. The herbarium does not have unlimited resources for the purchase of material so I would like an estimate from you as to the number of specimens in these two families which you might collect annually and the price per sheet. We might be interested also in the purchase of other material although we would not be able to name it for you. What would be the approximate size and cost of a complete set of your specimens annually?

While I worked at the National Herbarium and the New York Botanical Garden Kew sent me most of your collections of Umbelliferae for identification. Among them were the following numbers, some of which may be new, of which I would like mature fruiting specimens if it is possible for you to obtain them: 7967, 8367, 8099, 7939, 8040 and 7346. The people at Kew may have asked you for this material but thus far none of it has been sent me. In fact I have seen none of your collections since I came here in the fall of 1936. I should like also specimens with field notes showing the differences, if any, in the lateral and terminal branches of Prinosciadium and the various growth stages of such genera as Bryngium and Arracacia.

Very truly yours,

Mildred E. Mathias,
Research Associate in Botany

1156 Keeler Ave.,
Berkeley, California
29 September 1938

Mr. Reed C. Rollins,
Gray Herbarium,
Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass.

Dear Reed:

Have you ever stayed awake nights thinking of the extinct species and varieties you may have described? Once in a while I get a bit worried over Neoparrya, not collected since 1857 or some such date. But it should still be flourishing since there are no active volcanoes about. If you'll find Neoparrya again for me maybe I can locate Smelowskia ovalis var. congesta because as you say "this natural entity seems to have stabilized itself sufficiently to receive nomenclatorial designation." You also say it's "isolated;" in that you are right - if it's still on Lassen Peak it most certainly must be isolated.

I had hoped to warn you and remind you of the eruptions of Lassen Peak between 1914 and 1921 before you reached the publication stage but your paper appeared the week I climbed Lassen. And I climbed that not, desolate peak to the very top for the sole purpose of finding your Smelowskia or at least a proper habitat for it. I had two companions aiding in the search for it and I feel we made a fairly comprehensive survey of the peak and its still steaming crater. If Smelowskia is still there I shall have to do the proverbial hat-eating because there is nothing near an arctic-alpine association anywhere on the peak and I can just about list on my fingers the plants which are there. The top five hundred feet was completely lacking in flora - below that in descending order are such things as Gilia congesta, Streptanthus sp., Holodiscus, Arabis sp. (too far gone to collect), Pinus albicaulis, and the endemic lupine, the name of which I've forgotten at the moment. There were here and there a few other things but not in great number and apparently just establishing themselves on the slopes of the peak since all of them were fairly common around the lakes near the base. The top of the mountain was blown off in 1915 and everything on the north and east sides is a picture of desolation - dead and blown down trees, lava boulders, mud flats, etc. The park botanists report that again and again they have hunted some plant reported on Lassen Peak by Jepson (from Chesnut and Drew or Lemmon colls.) and rarely, if ever, do they find it.

I looked over the park herbarium - minute and mostly from lower elevations (collections by Herbert Copeland) - with no luck and the park service has no record of Smelowskia having been collected in the park. So I gave them the records for it and told them to start looking. The man I talked to knew families and genera and had collected on Lassen Peak and other high peaks a number of times and said he was convinced it wasn't there.

However this last summer Burgess made an extensive collection in the park which I didn't see since it was being mounted by the park service here in Berkeley. He knows what he's doing apparently so you might write him and find out if he collected your pet -

Mr. Joseph Burgess,
Washington High School,
Manhattan Beach, California.

The information that I got is that they are always a bit upset by the complete absence of an arctic-alpine flora on Lassen Peak, the highest in the park, since they do get such associations on Loomis, Ski Heil, and Brokeoff mountains. Personally I think it's a swell opportunity for an ecological study by some one. So maybe your Smelowskia is hanging around on another mountain. If I had had the time I would have climbed at least one of them but there will be a next time and now I'm interested enough to make an extensive search.

Emerald Lake near the foot of Lassen Peak had more alpine than any other place I visited - baby willows, ericads, etc. but I searched its banks and surrounding talus with not much luck.

Suppose we form a Neoparrya-Smelowskia association and see what we can do. But I warn you, and I'm heeding my own warning too, never describe anything collected on Lassen Peak or in the vicinity before 1921 until you've personally found it again. We might drink to a cessation of volcanic activity.

Sincerely,

Mildred E. Mathias

1156 Keeler Ave.
Berkeley, California
January 10, 1939

Miss Alice Eastwood,
California Academy of Sciences,
San Francisco, California

Dear Miss Eastwood:

It is indeed a pleasure to greet you on your eightieth birthday. AND I am delighted that I shall be able to extend my greetings in person on this memorable occasion.

You are to be congratulated not only on a milestone attained but on the noteworthy contributions which you have made to botanical science. I can mention in particular, in connection with my own studies, your many valuable collections of Umbelliferae and your remarkable ability to locate and collect the unusual in the field. These collections have been of invaluable assistance in the course of my monographic studies.

Mr. Hassler joins me in extending the very best of wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred Mathias Hassler

1156 Keeler Ave.
Berkeley, California
24 January 1939

Dr. Rogers McVaugh,
Bureau of Plant Industry,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Dr. McVaugh:

The specimen of Umbelliferae which you sent me for identification November 23rd last is Ammi Majus L., a native of southern Europe and northern Africa. I have records of it established at Tampico, Mexico, Washington County, South Dakota, Bermuda and Martinique. It is rapidly spreading through Texas where it is commonly grown as a garden plant and locally known as "Queen Anne's Lace." It is the most common umbel in the southern Napa Valley and occurs in the Sacramento Valley here in California.

I am sorry for the delay in answering this request. The correspondence got mislaid, the specimen turned over to the herbarium, and I promptly forgot all about it until I unearthed your letter.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

1156 Keeler Ave.
Berkeley, California
24 January 1939

Mr. T. H. Kearney,
Bureau of Plant Industry,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Kearney:

I have just checked over your list of the species of Umbelliferae which occur in Arizona and which I assume at the moment is complete. With the exception of possibly some six species I have descriptions written and the few I have not studied are so well known that there will be no difficulty with them. Thus I should be able to have the manuscript to you in final form within a month if all goes well. I hesitate to make any promises or set a definite date since I am still working on a very much limited schedule and I can make no plans from one day to the next. However I shall do my best for you and if I find that I cannot complete the manuscript within the next few weeks I shall notify you accordingly.

My best regards to every one in Washington, particularly the lunch mess group.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

1156 Keeler Ave.
Berkeley, California
24 January 1939

Mr. Reed C. Rollins,
Gray Herbarium,
Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dear Reed:

First I want to thank you for your nice letter of weeks ago. I had hoped to surprise you with a letter in the hospital with these detts but somehow before I knew it you were out braving the icy streets of Cambridge, which I hear are still in that sad state, so I kept on procrastinating. I hope you are up to par by now and ready for another summer of climbing mountains. I have taken to climbing a bit myself recently for more exercise. I didn't go very far on fruit juices though, particularly when I have to start loaded with bottles of food.

Your specimens were most interesting. Here are the names:

- 2367 *Lomatium juniperinum* (Jones) Coult. & Rose
4th collection, all the others made
30 or more years ago.
- 2350 *Lomatium megarrhizum* (Nels.) Mathias
- 2344 *Leptotaenia Eatonii* Coult. & Rose
- 2702 *Lomatium angustatum* var. *flavum* G. N. Jones
- 2692 *Lomatium nudicaule* (Pursh) Coult. & Rose
- 2301 *Lomatium Grayi* Coult. & Rose
- 2481 *Pseudocymopterus humboldtensis* (Jones) Mathias
3rd collection, others by Jones in 1897 and
1901
- 2145 *Pteryxia terebinthina* var. *calcareae* (Jones)
Mathias
- 2103, 2245 *Cymopterus bulbosus* Nels. No. 2245 from
near the type locality.

The var. *flavum* of *Lomatium angustatum* is an endemic in the Olympic Peninsula. I wish all the collections which come in for determination would have as high an average of interesting things. You and Carl Sharsmith hold the prizes for this year.

Sincerely,

25 January 1939

Dr. Roman A. Perez Moreau,
Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales,
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dear Sir:

Under separate cover I have sent you copies of several of my recent publications of the Umbelliferae.

I am very grateful to you for sending me the paper on the genus Lilaeopsis in Argentina. Dr. Schulz, of Colonia Benitez, has informed me that he sent you the specimens of Lilaeopsis which he had previously referred to me for identification. I suggested that he send them to you since I knew you were working on the genus in Argentina.

He has also sent me some specimens of E. yagium which I have not been able to name. If you would be interested in seeing them I shall be glad to forward them to you for your identifications.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

1156 Keeler Ave.
Berkeley, California
25 January 1939

Dear Joe,

Here are the names for the specimens which you sent me last spring. I assume they are to be turned over to the herbarium.

9860 *Deweya Parishii* (C. & R.) Mathias, ined.
10657 *Daucus Carota* L.
10531 *Osmorhiza Leibergii* (C. & R.) Blankins.
9980 *O. nuda* Torr.
10051 *O. nuda* Torr.
10668 *Cicuta vagans* Greene
8167 *C. vagans* Greene
Hutchinson 7216 *Eryngium Wrightii* Gray

Notice the retention of *Deweya*. At least I hope that will be the name retained. *Velaea*, as I doubtless mentioned to you, can not be used and I had been using *Tauschia*, following Macbride's discussion of the subject. Only recently I found that there was a previously described *Tauschia* which both Macbride and I had overlooked although it is in the indices. I don't know how he missed it. I had been following him without bothering to check on it until I got ready for publication so now I'm changing horses in midstream again. I have reached the state where I have to stop and think of the proper generic name.

Enclosed are the prints and negatives of *Delphinium Andersonii* taken in the field. I am sorry they are light struck. My camera has a leak somewhere which so far I haven't located. It only turns up on rare occasions and, of course, when I least want it to. But the exposure seems to be good and a photographer should be able to enlarge the *Delphinium* part leaving out the light streaks. Anyway they show my good intentions and do give you some idea of one of its habitats. These specimens were later collected and are my number 1371 in part (along with the rest of the species which I could locate). The flowers were deep purple, approximately the shade of no. 1242. Associates were *Artemisia* sp., *Chrysothamnus* sp. and *Purshia*, on sandy slopes 4-4½ miles southwest of Carson City, Nevada along Highway 50. The locality is in some ways quite different from the place where I found the species before and also is much closer to Virginia City. After collecting it in this last locality I would not be surprised to find it in the canyons leading into Virginia City. It is most inconspicuous in the sagebrush even in full flower and apparently very spotty and comparatively rare. The date was May 15th last. I have quite a raft of *Delphiniums* for you from this last years collections and I shall bundle them up and send them off when I can find time for the job.

Incidentally I made quite an impression on my brother-in-law who was along on the last Nevada collecting trip by spotting that Delphinium from the car window when we were travelling about 50 miles per hour. We stopped and went back for and it took the two of us a good half hour of scouting to find enough specimens to make a good sheet or two. Apparently I had spotted the only visible specimen within miles. On the same trip we spent hours and hours hunting a tiny Nemophila for Lincoln, which we finally found and so tiny that we put it in a milk bottle to bring back to him. A quart bottle full had enough material for 20 copious sheets and some left over for the artist and pickling. We found it in a roadside camp ground full of people eating lunch and the two of us were quite the center of attention on our hands and knees pulling up the tiny things. Needless to say we had plenty of explanations to make.

I haven't yet sent out my Lomatium reprints. One of these days you will get one, I should have gotten one to you before the last collecting season so you could have used it in the field and given my a few criticisms of keys, etc. There are plenty of errors in it, many of them the fault of hurried proof reading in the rush of getting the thing ready for the Greenman dinner. So the reprints I send out are well annotated.

I am getting back to the herbarium a few hours a week now. Yesterday I got off some 400 specimens to Thompson so I feel that I am accomplishing something. My desk was piled so high that I had to do something drastic. I should estimate that near 1000 specimens have come in for detts since I took to my bed last October. I have hopes of finishing some manuscript soon but I have to do something about the specimens first and at the moment that looks like a full time job.

I know there is news you want. Among other things you wanted to hear about the Jepson dinner but you've probably heard all that from some one else. Have you heard about the Eastwood luncheon? If you will send me a list of questions I shall endeavor to answer them more or less immediately. I am devoting two or three hours every morning to typing now and I am becoming a better correspondent now that I have a schedule.

Best wishes to Nesta. We enjoyed the picture of Kathleen on the Xmas card. She will be grown up, I fear, before I see her in person.

Sincerely,

27 April 1939

Dr. William R. Maxon,
United States National Museum,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Dr. Maxon:

Twelve of the fourteen Lyonnet specimens were to be returned by the herbarium staff yesterday. The other two specimens are both undetermined, possibly new, species of *Musciniopsis* (if that is a good genus). They are numbers 1745551 (Lyonnet 1767) and 1745718 (Lyonnet 1150). I am planning to complete a study of this genus within the next few weeks and shall keep these specimens, and very probably borrow others from you, until then.

I am still on the "invalid" list although I don't look it. But my diet and rest schedule is about that of a two year old except that I eat every two hours. And I shall be limited in activity for several years at least. So I am taking advantage of this forced semi-retirement to start a family. The first child is due in October. Pregnancy has had a very favorable effect on the pyloric ulcer and a few years of quiet will probably make my "innards" as good as new.

Dr. Constance has become a coworker in the umbels. We are working together at the moment - rather he works and I supervise - but I hope he can take over completely when we finish all the urgent manuscripts this summer. He will take over routine identifications and I hope continue actively with the family. When and if health and family permit and I return to active research I can always find another interesting group.

So the next time I visit Washington I shall probably be showing babies the sights instead of rushing around hunting specimens.

My best regards to everyone.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

27 April 1939.

Dr. H. A. Gleason,
New York Botanical Garden,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Gleason:

The manuscript on the umbels has progressed more rapidly in recent weeks than it has for the past two years. The reason is that I have finally given up and recruited aid and the umbels have a co-author. It took six months of arguments with the doctors to convince me that I should drop all research at least temporarily since the ulcer was not responding to treatment. So Dr. Constance has taken over my work in large part. I manage a few hours a week with him at the university outlining a program and otherwise he carries on alone, uses the phone, or pays me a visit.

Between the two of us there is a prospect of turning out the complete work before the end of the summer. At least that is our present plan and hope. Also Dr. Constance wants to start on the Hydrophyllaceae manuscript in the fall.

Dr. Constance was an ideal choice, first, since he is at hand and we can work together and, second, because he knows more about western Umbelliferae, one of the largest groups, than anyone else I know. He has studied them extensively in the field so he has been able to take over the work easily and ably. I hope that he will carry on with the incidental determinations and such routine until I can return to research although I have given him free rein with the family and if he does care to go on with it I shall hunt another group for future studies.

Another reason for this arrangement is that since I shall have to spend a year or more quietly and several more years on a somewhat rigid schedule of rest and diet we, and the doctors, have decided it is a good idea to start raising the long talked-of family. Pregnancy frequently has a favorable effect on stomach ulcers and at the moment I am a good example of that effect. The first child is due in October and I feel better daily. So for the next few years I shall be shifted from Botany to babies.

We are "polishing off" genera at a great rate now. Probably sometime soon I shall send you a request for a loan of a number of specimens. At the moment we are checking all the incomplete groups to find out what material it will be necessary to borrow.

My regards to your family and the "coffee crowd"

Sincerely,

Shawsmith

May 8, 1939

Dear Carl and Helen,

I suppose by now you have received the names on the Mt. Hamilton collections except for the two or three sheets which I still have to worry about. Also, Lincoln has probably returned the loan of *Ligusticum* sp. will soon. The other item of business is the names for the few sheets which you sent me in December. They are as follows:

- 3886 *Ligusticum Canbyi* C. & R.
- 3881 *L. tenuifolium* Wats.
- 3855 *Pteryxia terebinthina* (Hook.) C. & R.
- 2184 *Lomatium Torreyi* C. & R.
- 3630 *Oreonana clementis* (Jones) Jeps.
- 3925 *Lomatium oregonum* C. & R.

Numbers 3630 and 3925, as you requested, have been sent to the Stanford Herbarium. The other sheets are in the herbarium here. I also corrected the label for *Lomatium oregonum*. It is nice to have this additional collection of that rare species - and such good material too. We also rewrote one of the other labels - I've forgotten which one it was except that it was for one of the four sheets which we kept here. You had used a Flora of California label for an Oregon or Washington specimen or vice versa. Anyway we fixed it and I mention it only because you may want to check the duplicate labels to see if the same error occurred.

As you have probably heard Lincoln is now the authority on the umbels even though he may hesitate to admit it. I am giving up active research for a few years in order to cure the ulcer and also to start a family (the first is due in October. ~~xxxxxxx~~ Lincoln is the only one at the herbarium to know about it. But I shall have to break the news soon). Lincoln has been very nice about coming to my aid and the two of us hope to finish the various urgent manuscripts this summer. He has been doing a swell job so far and he really knows his umbels.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred M. Hassler

May 8, 1939

Mr. H. C. Benke,
4034 Montrose Ave.,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Mr. Benke:

Thank you for the interesting specimens of Daucus Carota. I have seen thousands of specimens of this species, having lived in fields of it in Pennsylvania, but this is the first with the petals as green as these. Other color variations are relatively common- pink, purple and even yellow flowers occur. However I do not feel that the green color form is worthy of nomenclatorial notice since in other species in this family white flowered plants frequently show this color variation to green. And descriptions of Daucus Carota in its native habitat in Europe give the flower color as varying from white to pink, purple, yellow and greenish. I am indeed grateful for the specimens since it is the first record of the green color form in this country.

I am sorry for the long delay in answering your letter but I have been ill for a number of months and my work has been accumulating on my desk in the meantime.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

May 8, 1939

Mr. C. O. Erlanson,
Bureau of Plant Industry,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Carl,

I've been trying to get around to writing you a letter ever since the umbels were sent back. However, Dr. Constance said he wrote you all the necessary details - such as that we had kept the specimens of the third set which we wanted and also one sheet of Eryngium, no. 7154, which we hope to identify when we do that genus. It may be a new species. Do you have any more material of Eryngium from Nevada? If you do I would like very much to have it in the next few weeks. I shall send back the Eryngium, a unicate, when we get a name for it. There isn't much material and it would be nice to have more if you have it.

Dr. Constance is taking over my umbels at least temporarily and possibly permanently. As you have probably heard I have been having a devilish time with a pyloric ulcer so I haven't been able to do much research. Now I'm curing the ulcer by starting a family - the first is due in October - so I am giving up research for some time. I should have had to give up research anyway until I got the ulcer under control. And Dr. Constance has been very kind about helping and I hope he will take over the work permanently. Anyway he will do all the necessary routing identifications, consulting me if he gets stuck, and you can send him material if you need names. He knows umbels now better than anyone else I know and he is an all worker and I have complete confidence in his decisions.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

14 December 1939

Mr. Joseph Ewan,
University of Colorado,
Boulder, Colorado

Dear Joe:

I have gone through the Idaho paper hurriedly and made a few comments. Had I known earlier in the fall that there was to be a rush on it I could have managed a critical job. As it stands now it is most unsatisfactory from my point of view and I hate to see it published. Given some three or four months to study Epling's collections (which I have never seen), Christ's collections, those at Washington State and others, to check distributions, and time to check descriptions with those ready for the North American Flora (completed for all United States genera and almost so for Mexican) I could turn out a paper which might be worth publication. But as it is now I should prefer not having my name mentioned in the acknowledgments. I do not want to be blamed for possible errors and probable incompleteness.

Lincoln threatens a hot review if the Idaho flora is published in its present state since he feels as I do that publication should be postponed until more adequate field studies have been made. And he knows something about the region and its problems.

It seems to me that our literature is already overloaded with incomplete floras and why add another. The extensive collections of Constance, Christ and others made in recent years in northern Idaho have not been consulted in connection with this paper and even adding them that region is still too poorly known to warrant a flora. Of course the old argument holds that an incomplete flora is better than none and will attract attention to the region as a prospective field for profitable collecting. But with a man like Christ in the region and the fact that everyone is fully aware of the lack of complete information on the area immediate publications seems to me to be an error.

Sorry for the delay. Your first letter came a day or two after I got home from the hospital and my notes were not readily available. I did want to check a few names at least. That I have done. Jane is fine and I am back on my feet to the extent that I've become quite involved in Xmas preparations. After the first of the year I hope to get back to the umbels.

Best regards to Nesta.

Sincerely,

Woodson

Jan. 1940

284-99

Dear Bob,

I am having the herbarium return the one unicate of the Panamanian collection. From your Christmas note I expected a much bigger pile of specimens and was I relieved! I should estimate that at least a thousand specimens have come in for my desks since I took to my bed last October and my desk at the University is so covered that I can't see over them. Consequently the temptation is, on those rare occasions when I get down there for some work, to take one look at the desk and then go off and gossip with some one for the rest of the day.

There was no label for no. 1151. Will you send one, please, so the specimen can start through the mounting mill and thus be one more off my desk?

How is the Panama flora progressing? And how about the garden's finances? Has Papa Reynolds a job? And what is to happen to physiology? In other words how about a spot of news. Nell comes across now and then but it isn't enough. Tell Andy that his Christmas card is making the rounds of the botanical world in these parts but that I believe that many appreciate his address more than the card. There are more stupid people in this world, and quite a few of the most boring and uninteresting got collected in the UC herbarium. Don't tell anyone I said so. After all I am doing my best to stay on good terms with all the bores. Pollyanna like, I have hopes of some day finding something nice in their make-up.

Sincerely,

February 14, 1940

Dr. Harold N. Moldenke,
New York Botanical Garden,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Moldenke:

I hesitate to undertake any work on Argentine umbels for two reasons. First there is very little diagnostic material of them in this country and they are a group badly in need of field study. And secondly because Dr. Perez-Moreau at the Museo in Buenos Aires has been working on them for some time and has already published numerous papers. We have cooperated in our work so far and I do not want to invade his field. So I would suggest that if it is possible you send the specimens to him for study.

However, if for various reasons you do not want to ship the specimens out of the country I will do what I can with them although I should like to feel free to refer all questionable specimens to him for study and description if they prove new. As far as I can tell he is doing excellent work.

Dr. Constance tells me you have written him concerning the Hydrophyllaceae. I doubt if any one else here would be interested although Dr. Mason might consider studying the Polemoniaceae.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

February 14, 1940

Dr. W. L. Jepson,
University of California,
Berkeley, California

Dear Dr. Jepson:

I want to thank you for the bundle of reprints which Dr. Constance delivered to me some weeks ago.

Dr. Constance gave an account of the reason for using the name Lomatium in the review of the paper for Madrono. I have forgotten the exact issue but it was one appearing in the spring of 1938. After much writing and telegraphing at the last minute the nomenclature committee - at least those members who could be reached - agreed on the name Lomatium.

I have been too busy with my new daughter to get to the herbarium much recently. However, I am beginning to have more time now. And I should be pleased to visit you some time. Any time you arrange with Dr. Constance will suit me.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

February 14, 1940

Mr. W. A. Dayton,
Atlantic Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Dayton:

After going over the literature and specimens again both Dr. Constance and I came to my former conclusion that the genus Archangelica is not a valid one. Therefore the correct botanical name for Garden Angelica is Angelica Archangelica L.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

February 23, 1940

Dr. Roman A. Perez-Moreau,
Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales,
Bernardino Rivadavia,
Buenos Aires, Argentine

Dear Dr. Perez-Moreau:

Under separate cover I am sending you several specimens of Umbelliferae from Argentine, collections of Schulz. I should appreciate having names for them. Dr. Schulz sent these to me some time ago and at the time I suggested that he send you specimens of these numbers for identification. So you may have named these specimens for him before. You may keep these specimens; they are portions of sheets deposited in the herbarium of the University of California.

What groups of Umbelliferae are you working on at present? Dr. Constance and I are completing the paper on the family for the North American Flora.

We should like to have typical material of South American species in our collection and would appreciate any material of Umbelliferae you may have for exchange for California species.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

1156 Keeler Ave.
Berkeley, California
July 15, 1940

Dr. H. A. Gleason,
New York Botanical Garden,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Gleason:

The genus Eryngium has been completed and the manuscript will be mailed you as soon as we finish checking it - I hope within the week. We have prepared a synopsis of the genus, with a key to the species and citation of typical specimens, which because of the citations should be a valuable supplement to the North American Flora paper. Would it be possible to publish it in Brittonia? The paper is 52 standard type pages, 10 of which are the key to the species.

We have considered the possibility of preparing similar synopses of the other large genera since citations are of so much value in understanding the author's concepts of the species. None of them would be as long as that for Eryngium, probably averaging 20-25 pages. Do you think such papers should be or could be published?

There are several shorter papers also ready for publication including new combinations, species, etc. They should be published as soon as possible. I have written the Missouri Botanical Garden about the possibility of including one or more of them in the Annals. Again I have wondered about the chances of getting them in Brittonia in the near future. One paper is 12 pages long; the others I haven't typed in final copy but they will be shorter.

All the large genera are completed now and we hope to start sending you manuscript in the near future - as soon as we complete a satisfactory key to the genera.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

March 13, 1941

Dear Red:

Are our collective faces red! I didn't believe it possible until I went home and read the Journal. It just goes to show you what criticising other's papers will lead to. And I wonder what sort of cat-naps the editorial board were taking. Your criticism is certainly well made and this is an opportunity for a good jab in Taxonomic Index. More power to you! We'll grin and take it for the good of the cause.

Of course we helped with the citation of such diverse journals as Bull. Soc. Nat. Mosc., D6. Prod. & Coll. Mem.; and Bost. Journ. Nat. Hist. The plants might range from New England to the Russian steppes. If you had had the eye of a Sherlock Holmes you would have recognized the Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. & as the Monograph of the North American Umbelliferae and the Bost. Journ. Nat. Hist. as Pl. Lindheimerae. For the sake of the record (and Lincoln says he'll write Weatherby so the Gray Index won't miss us) both Limnoscium and Cynoscium are natives of the great Southwest. Cynoscium ranges from Arkansas to Texas and Limnoscium from Missouri and Kansas to Texas. After all we did publish in the American Journal of Botany.

I like your comments on the type species too. We're aware of the N. Am. Flora policy and disagree with their method of citation. There are cases in old numbers where the type species name is completely lost in the synonymy under some other ~~xxxxxx~~ retained specific name which just leads to confusion. For completeness the citation should read - Type species: Limnoscium pinnatum (DC.) Mathias & Cois tance (Cynoscium pinnatum DC.) or some similar form. That gives the complete story and that's the way we're doing N. Am. Flora manuscript. So I'm expecting an argument with the editors. If that's the only argument we'll have we'll be lucky.

Lincoln is typing nobly these days while my only contribution seems to be a guilty conscience and occasional struggles with the keys. They're my field of work and the generic key is horrible. My domestic involvements are worse and worse so I find my Umbel hours grabbed at odd moments - certainly not conducive to rapid results.

Why don't you come and see our western blueberries again?

As ever,

August 7, 1942

W. A. Dayton,
Forest Service,
U. S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Dayton:

I am delighted with the paper on Umbelliferae. I wish more local floras attained such a standard of excellence.

I have gone over the paper critically in comparison with our manuscript for the North American Flora which has been in the hands of the editors for about a year. There are very few points of difference and those are all of a minor nature as you can see from the following notes. The record for Seseli libanotis is new to us.

p. 3. Osmorhiza is keyed out "Roots aromatic, anise-scented" and as you have noted in the description on p. 14 O. Claytoni is not strongly scented. I have collected specimens which could hardly be called aromatic.

p. 4. The key would be strengthened, I think, by adding "fruit winged" to the characters of Thaspium.

p/ 6. Why not add leaf characters to the key?
Leaves shallowly lobed.....H. americana
Leaves lobed about to the middle.....H. ranunculoides

According to Merrill (I do not have the reference to his paper at hand) the correct name for Hydrocotyle rotundifolia is H. sibthorpioides Lam. Encyc. 3: 153. 1789. The synonymy is H. rotundifolia Roxb. Hort. Beng. 21. 1814, not of Wall. 1828.

Detailed distribution for H. americana is Newfoundland to North Carolina, west to Wisconsin; for H. ranunculoides Pennsylvania and Delaware to Florida west to Arkansas, Texas and Arizona; Washington south along the coast to Panama, etc.

Hydrocotyle umbellata, H. verticillata and H. verticillata var. triradiata may be found in your region. if you include much area toward the coast.

p. 9. Sanicula canadensis extends to Florida and west to South Dakota and Texas; Sanicula gregaria: Quebec to Florida, west to South Dakota and Louisiana; Sanicula marilandica occurs in British Columbia, Idaho and Washington.

Sanicula trifoliata Bickn. may occur in the region.

p. 12. Is the reference for Chaerophyllum procumbens
p. 77 or 27? We have the latter page number.

According to our interpretation of Chaerophyllum procumbens var. Shortii Torr. & Gray it is limited, as far as we know, to the Ohio River valley, Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky. Probably the plants you have referred here are rightly C. Tainturieri which has been collected in Virginia.

p. 14. The reference for Osmorhiza Claytoni (Michx.) Clarke should be qualified to read Hook. f., Fl. Brit. Ind. 2: 690. 1879, as to name only.

p. 15. We have reduced Osmorhiza longistylis var. brachycoma Blake to O. longistylis var. villicaulis Fern.

Torilis japonicus occurs also in California, Oregon and Haiti.

p. 17. Conium maculatum in California commonly grows to a height of 10 feet and I have seen occasional plants 12 to 15 feet high. It is one of the most common weeds throughout coastal California.

p. 18. The citation I have for Zizia Koch is p. 128. 1824.

p. 19. Zizia aptera ranges to British Columbia, Washington and Oregon. It is also in Utah.

The citation for Z. aurea is 1824.

p. 23. The spelling used by Kuntze was "Deeringia" (synonymy for Cryptotaenia.)

p. 24. The year of publication of Taenidia and T. integerri-
ma is 1898. The citation for Zizia integerrima (L.) DC. is Mem.
Soc. Phys. Genew. 4: 493. 1826.

p. 25. The citation we have for Ptilimnium capillaceum
(Michx.) Raf. is Amer. Month. Mag. 192. 1812.

Ptilimnium (Harperella) viviparum may occur in your region since the type locality is near Hancock, Maryland and it has been collected at Harper's Ferry.

p. 26. The correct name for the Oenanthe is O. squatica
(L.) Poir. ex Lam. Encycl. 4: 530. 1795.

p. 28. Lilaeopsis chinensis has been collected as far north as Nova Scotia.

The citation we have for Foeniculum is F. vulgare
Miller, Gard. Dict. ed. 8. no. 1. 1768.

p. 28. We recognize only three species of Thaspium.

p. 28/ We recognize only three species of Thaspium.
T. trifoliatum (L.) Gray (Man. Bot. ed. 2. 156. 1858, as to name
only) should occur in your region.

p. 29. The synonymy we have for Thaspium barbinode Nutt.
is Ligusticum(?) barbinode Michx. Fl. Bor. Amer. 1: 167. 1803;
Smyrniun barbinode Muhl. Cat. 31. 1813. This species has been
collected in Oklahoma.

The page reference I have for Archangelica Hoffm.
in p. 162.

p. 30. The page reference I have for Archemora DC. is
p. 52. We recognize seven species of Oxypolis. O. filiformis
occurs in the Bahamas as well as in Cuba.

The references I have for Oxypolis rigidior is
(L.) Raf. ex Seringe, Bull. Bot. 1: 128. 1830. The citation
for Oenanthe rigida is Crantz, Cl. Umbel. Emend. 85. 1769.

p. 31. Oxypolis rigidior occurs in Texas. We have
reduced variety ambigua to the species.

Oxypolis Canbyi has been collected from Delaware
to Georgia so may occur in the region.

Pastinaca sativa L. page reference is pl. 262.

p. 32. Heracleum Sphondylium L. is adventive in Nova
Scotia, New York City and Washington (state).

p. 33. Heracleum lanatum is not confined to moist sites
in the California coast ranges.

The differences in page numbers and dates of publication
may be our errors and not yours as I do not have the original
publications available here in many cases and do not have the
final checked manuscript from the editors.

Congratulations on such a fine paper so well illustrated.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

Take your choice. ^{Western botanists, excepting Murray}
~~now generally used~~ ^{and Cappuccella probably}
~~rather indicate strict adherence to rules~~ ^{Japan prefer Cappuccella}
~~in dicots Compositum~~ ^{I have used Cappuccella}
~~in previous publications~~ ^{which in some}
~~used for this revision probably will be the choice~~
 of committee. ^{Mitcheil}

A.C. Smith

Dear Al,

I am finally returning the galley proof. You've probably wondered what happened to it; but I wanted Dengler to see the changes in his Latin and, unfortunately, he was ill for several days. In most cases he approved but there are a few changes noted on the proof which he made either as corrections or improvements.

Shouldn't Key to the Species precede the key in the Hydrocotyle paper? Does meters' elevation require an apostrophe after the meters? The expression is used in a few cases and I note the printer inserted the apostrophe. You seem to prefer omitting the herbarium designation after the type specimen citation. It may be wise in the case of some old species. But you weren't consistent about it. It seems to me that it should be put in in all cases where it is known or left out in the case of all old species. I prefer the former and I've made marginal notes to that effect. However, it isn't vital and you can do what you wish. The description of species 11 is a bit rough with all the the's but it's not so good without them either. If you can improve it, do so. I notice that you have changed the position of the expression not peltate in most of the cases where it occurred. I much prefer it as the character immediately divides the species into groups. I have questioned the changes in the proof. Perhaps non-peltate would be a better expression. Species 35b- Isn't Napo-Pastaza a state? I understood from Killip that it was and if so, in the citation of specimens it should precede the locality and read Napo-Pastaza: Archidona. I think its a relatively new division as a state, a separation from one of the old areas. The other changes I've made are noted in the galley and I think you'll be able to interpret them.

I shall want a hundred reprints of each paper, bound separately and with covers.

I see no reason why I should see the page proof since there are not too many changes in the galley.

We had a nice visit with Alexander and Martin, short but crowded with accounts of the summer's trip.

Sincerely,

Dear Al,

This is what I call last minute action but with Gerald's papers to type and innumerable specimens to determine I've had a hard time getting the finishing touches on these two papers.

There are several things to be checked, namely:
Short Paper.

The Latin in the short paper is of my own invention and might stand a critical eye. It looks all right to me but that doesn't mean much. The Latin in the *Hydrocotyle* paper was checked by the head of the dept. here so should be ok.

I have no list of abbreviations for herbaria in the short paper. Probably you would like them in a footnote. There are only four herbaria cited - US, K, NY, GH; the abbreviations are the same as in the *Hydrocotyle* paper.

Will you check the page number in the footnote on page 8? It might be 31 or 30. I don't have the article and I guessed from the pages on which the transfers were made. The page reference should be that for the beginning of the article.

The note on page 15 is a question of rules. When a new name is necessary for a species are the transfers of varieties new combinations or what? I've never met with the situation before. So fix it if necessary.

Hydrocotyle verticillata var. *racemosa* is listed as a new combination in both papers. The Brittonia citation will have to be inserted in whichever paper is second in the issue.

Hydrocotyle paper:

Is *H. quinquerradiata* Pet. Thours listed in Kew Index? It was not published by Richard as it is at present listed in the synonymy on p. 15 and should be deleted unless listed by Kew in which case the Kew reference should be inserted instead of that of Richard.

What is the page reference for the footnote on p. 23? I had that on my list of things to check on my last NY trip but I overlooked it.

Is the distribution of *H. Humboldtii* var. *macrophylla* on p. 31 correct for the specimens cited?

Is the locality on p. 35 El Pinon or El Penon? I wrote Buddie for the information but he neglected to send it. In case you don't know the locality leave it as it is and I'll try to get an answer from Buddie.

Is the distribution for *H. gumerifolia* on p. 42 correct for the specimens cited?

If any of these things need changing please do it. I'm sorry to have to bother you with looking up a few references but there's no way to check such things out here in the middle of nowhere.

We may possibly be in N. Y. soon. Gerald has the vacation bug and is considering N. Y. for a day or so among other places. So we'll probably start out this week-end for various places along the coast where he hopes to find a chance to do some sailing.

Sincerely,

Dear Nell,

I hope the _____ proof is correct. Every time I look at it I see another error but I'm so near blind now that it's hopeless so I'm rushing this back to you in the hope that it will give me time to see the page proof and I can catch the other inconsistencies, etc. in it. The following are notes for your perusal with the galley. In most cases a note is on the margin of the galley but in some cases I didn't go into details.

Why not run the abbreviations in a footnote? It looks neater.

Peucedanum of Am. auth., not of Linnaeus should certainly be included in the generic synonymy since all the earlier treatments were under that name.

For type species I think it would be better to put: Lomatium villosum Raf. Journ. Phys. 89: 101. 1819 which equals L. foeniculaceum (Nutt.) Coult. & Rose, Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 7: 222. 1900. That keeps the history straighter.

Sp. 5. The original description used the spelling Nicholas. The preferred spelling at present is the Spanish Nicolas.

Sp. 7. In the form the citations are reversed.

In Sp. 15, and in synonymy of sp. 28 and 29, I think Nutt. should be the parenthetical authority since Torr. & Gray took up his manuscript name and site it as a synonym. But abide by the MBG authorities. In the syn. the citation should be C. leptocarpa (Nutt.) Jones as originally published.

Note top of pl 25 of galley relative to Coult.

sp. 21a. set-up shows the old Gray Herb.-Rhodora influence.

How habits stick!

sp. 24a. Check the sp. of Mangus please in your Rand McNalley. I think the us is correct.

sp. 28. *C. villosa* (Raf.) Spreng. was published on p. xlviij instead of 588. *C. villosa* (Raf.) Schult. is on p. 588. Although the transfer was not actually so printed on p. xlviij only one species was involved and acc. to Barnhart that constitutes a transfer.

sp. 34. The Hook. & Arn. publication is earlier than Torr. & Gray and there is no doubt about the identity of the H. & A. plant. Therefore I can see no reason why H. & A. should not be the parenthetical authors and their citation given first. T. & G. refer the H. & A. plant questionably to their species but I have seen specimens compared with the H. & A. plant and they are true macrocarpa. And if you insist on Nuttall (and I ceratinly do not agree) then the type is a Nuttall specimen from the Oregon and not Douglas coll.

sp. 46. Note Latin descr. I won't stand for -que and et too. Which do you want? I do not like solitariis since to me that might mean several leaves borne singly and remotely as contrasted with a cluster or whorl. I want a word meaning one.

sp. 56. Benth. & Hook. Gen. 1: 884. 1867 refer this to Peucedanum without making a binomial combination. Technically it might be cited in syn. as *Peucedanum tenuifolium* Benth. & Hook. etc., not of Eckl. or whoever the other *P. tenuifolium* was published by.

sp. 58. I certainly hate to be responsible for making a new combination out of St. John's form. I don't like the things. I haven't had a chance to see his specimens and there's a chance that they might be one of the many varieties, part. anomalum. Why not run his citation in a footnote with a statement that no

specimens have been seen. If it is really triternata then I don't feel that a form can be recognized in a group as variable in leaf size as that one. So do something so I won't be responsible for a new combination if you can.

Sp. 58. I don't like this as var. puberulum since I certainly am dubious about anomalum and puberulum being the same even though the types match. The distribution is too funny. So Why not call it var. anomalum and put question marks in front of the four citations of giganteum and puberulum. Then insert a note as follows: *Lomatium giganteum* Coult. & Rose and *L. nudicaule* var. *puberulum* Jepson are identical. The Bolander specimen (UC type coll) ^{though immature,} is a good match for the type of *L. anomalum* Jones so these plants have been questionably referred to this variety even though they are known only from northwestern California and typical *anomalum* has so far been collected only in ~~north~~ western Idaho. ~~There are~~ Further collections in the intervening area may show that the distribution is continuous in which case there will be no question as to their identity. This is poorly worded. See how you can doctor it. But I'm in a grand rush.

sp. 58b. Since I'm making a new combination I should certainly prefer the varietal name *robustius* if you can figure out a rule that will permit it. Then there need never be confusion with *L. macrocarpum*. Remember to make the name changes in the key and in the text under 58d if you change these names.

Sp. 58d. I don't like that add. to Jepson phrase. Know of a better one?

There are doubtless a hundred other things I should mention but I hope I have them clearly stated in the proof. I have rewritten the index to species and if at all possible I

should like to have it included. With so many names involved a reprint would be a mess to use without some sort of an index. And I have hopes that maybe somebody will use this paper.

It's 2:45 and I have guests coming for ~~at~~ 7 p. m. dinner. And I have to give the house a lick and a promise, go shopping, clean myself, and prepare the dinner. So no news this time.

Love and sympathy,

Howe
Dear Nell,

Finally I am shipping the Cogswellia manuscript to Dr. Moore, late as usual but I hope not too much so. I have been going ~~it~~ over it day and night for weeks but to be consistent in work spread out over ten years is certainly impossible. I ~~xxxx~~ hope I have caught all the inconsistencies and errors. And I also hope that the ms is not too badly marked up with corrections. If necessary I can retype it but at the moment I am thoroughly sick of the whole business. Since the first of July I have had guests continually and doing any work but sightseeing and cobbling has been almost impossible. In addition I spent a couple of weeks feeling so rotten - I pulled something loose inside me, - that I couldn't sit up very long at a time. The ms is not as long as it appears since the text is not continuous. I hope it will be about the right length. The citations could be put in 12 point type, also the synonymy, to shorten it. It would be advisable to have an index to the species too unless there is to be a special index for the number. But I would like an index to the species in the reprints if possible. If you think there will be room for it and can get the necessary permission let me know and I will send you one. There are ~~some~~ ~~pages~~ involved that it would be quite a help, in fact almost a necessity if the paper is to be used alone.

I have not had anyone check the Latin so cast an eagle eye over it please. Also should tap root and root stock be ~~xxxx~~ hyphenated. If so fix them. Nez Perce is correct, not Nez Perces. If I missed an s cross it off.

I must rush to the post office with this stopping at the herbarium for another date or two. I'll write you the news later.

Love,

Mildred

4004 Life Sciences Bldg.
University of California,
Berkeley, California

Mr. V. L. Cory,
Texas Agricultural Experiment Station,
Sonora, Texas

Dear Mr. Cory:

I am continuing my studies on the Umbelliferae at the herbarium of the University of California. The specimens of Umbelliferae which you mentioned in your letter of November 16th can be sent to me there. I shall be interested in seeing them as well as any other specimens of the family which you may collect.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias
Mildred E. Mathias

4004 Life Sciences Bldg.
University of California,
Berkeley, California

Dr. Ray J. Davis,
University of Idaho, Southern Branch,
Pocatello, Idaho.

Dear Dr. Davis:

I was quite delighted to have the opportunity to see such a large number of Umbelliferae from southern Idaho since that region is one of the least known botanically in the western United States. There were a number of specimens of interest, among them the numerous collections of Cymopterus acaulis which greatly change the recorded distribution of that species west of the Rocky Mountains. I should like very much to see more material of the two specimens which I have questionably labelled Perideridia Parishii, numbers 44-35 and 147-35. If you could collect additional material of these numbers both in the early spring with foliage and later in mature fruit I would appreciate it very much since so far this species has not been reported east of the Sierras.

May I suggest that if your specimens were numbered serially they would be easier to cite? Thanking you for the opportunity of examining this material, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias

Dear Nell,

Here are the first sheets of revision. Dr. Jepson has not yet put in appearance so I may have to do more revising when I get to see his specimens. I hope not and I'm keeping my fingers crossed.

p. 11. delete from and including SS to MM on p. 13. Substitute pp. 12 and 12a enclosed.

p. 9. In key C. cous instead of C. Cous.

p. 17. C. cous, P. cous and L. cous instead of Cous in each case.

p. 32. Cogswellia Gormanii f. purpurea etc... (Lomatium Gormanii f. purpureum etc.) should be the arrangement of names and citations. Maybe I caught that but my carbon doesn't show it.

Substitute pp. 64 and 64a enclosed for p. 64.

p. 66. Under C. foeniculacea add in the synonymy after Pastinaca foeniculacea Spreng.:

Cogswellia villosa (Raf.) Spreng.; Linn. Syst. Veg., ed. Roem. & Schult., 6: 588. 1820. The following Cogswellia villosa becomes C. villosa.

Substitute pp. 73 and 74 enclosed for 73 and 74 in mss.

p. 58. In the synonymy the name should be Lomatium nevadense var. Parishii (Coul. & Rose) Jepson, instead of nevadensis.

p. 70. In synonymy the correct name is Peucedanum orientale (Coul. & Rose) Blankinship.

p. 59. In synonymy the name should be Lomatium nevadense var. pseudorientale (Jones) Munz and not nevadensis var. pseudorientalis.

At the moment that's all but I may find some things to add later at the University.

You have my deepest sympathy. Had a brief visit with Hitchy but did not see Evelyn. He came out for lunch and was miserable with hay fever. Will write the news, if any, later.

Mathias, Mildred E.

A. B. Washington University, St. Louis, 1926

M. S. Henry Shaw School of Botany, Washington University, 1927

Ph. D. ibid, 1929

Jessie R. Barr Research Fellowship, Missouri Botanical
Garden, 1927-1929

Research Assistant, Missouri Botanical Garden, 1929-30

Field studies of Umbelliferae, western United States, 1929-31

Papers published:

Studies in the Umbelliferae. I. Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 15:
91-108. 1928.

Notes on Southwestern Plants. l. c. 16: 399-404. 1929.

Studies in the Umbelliferae. II. l. c. 16: 393-398. 1929.

Studies in the Umbelliferae. III. A Monograph of *Cymopterus*
including a critical study of related genera. l. c. 17: 213-
476. 1930.

"Botany", American Year Book, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, in
preparation.

Studies in the Umbelliferae. IV., in press.

Woodson

1156 Keeler Ave.,
Berkeley, Calif.
Oct. 16th

Dear Bob,

It makes little difference to me whether *Cogswellia* or *Lomatium* is used only I do wish some agreement could be reached concerning the situation. I should have obtained a decision from Sprague ages ago but you know how those things are. There's nothing like the good old-fashioned procrastination. But I have discussed the situation with everyone here and there over the country. Conversations with Gleason, Barnhart, Pennell and Greenman have all indicated a preference for *Cogswellia*. Even St. John finally gave in in his last publication. However to settle the matter once and for all, I hope, I am sending a telegram to Merrill and Weatherby asking for an immediate decision. Whatever they say will suit me. I am asking them to send a duplicate reply to you but in case they fail to I shall also wire you as soon as I receive a reply from them. I have asked that they reply collect so if you have to pay to receive your duplicate let me know how much and I shall send you some postage stamps or something to reimburse you.

To help you in case they choose *Lomatium* I have gone over the mss. and the following new combinations will be necessary - listed in the order in which they appear in the paper. In all other cases the correct combination has been published and is listed in the synonymy. You may rewrite the introduction to suit you if *Lomatium* is to be used.

Numbers indicate species numbers used in mss.

- 2. *L. repostum* (Jeps.) Mathias
- 9. *L. oregonioides* (Coult. & Rose) Mathias
- 21a. *L. utriculatum* var. *papillatum* (Henderson) Mathias
- 23b. *L. caruifolium* var. *marginatum* (Benth.) Mathias
- 23c. *L. caruifolium* var. *purpureum* (Jepson) Mathias
- 25b. *L. Plummerae* var. *Austinae* (Coult. & Rose) Mathias
- 25c. *L. Plummerae* var. *Helleri* Mathias
- 38. *L. Engelmannii* Mathias
- 40a. *L. Grayi* var. *depauperatum* (Jones) Mathias
- 41. *L. serpentinum* (Jones) Mathias
- 44. *L. minimum* Mathias
- 46. *L. Greenmanii* Mathias

- 48. *L. scabrum* (Coul. & Rose) Mathias
- 50. *L. concinnum* (Osterh.) Mathias
- 52a. *L. Nuttallii* var. *aplinum* (Wats.) Mathias
- 55. *L. latilobum* (Rydb.) Mathias
- 56. *L. megarrhizum* (Nels.) Mathias
- 57a. *L. simplex* var. *leptophyllum* (Hook.) Mathias
- 58a. *L. triternatum* var. *anomalum* (Jones) Mathias
- 58b. *L. triternatum* var. *robustius* (Coul. & Rose) Mathias
- 58c. *L. triternatum* var. *brevifolium* (Coul. & Rose) Mathias
- 58d. *L. triternatum* var. *alatum* (Coul. & Rose) Mathias
- 61a. *L. Suksdorfii* var. *Thompsonii* Mathias

I hope you're not as near the tearing the hair stage as I am and that I can manage to stay in your good graces in spite of all the air-mailing and telegraphing back and forth. Every time I write a paper I get into a mess some way or other. I really think that for the good of the world I should pick a nice quiet cave in the Panamints and go off and hide in it. It would also be one way to escape some of my numerous guests. At the moment I'm trying to finish a paper due in N. Y. Nov. 1st and I've had an unwelcome guest I can't get rid of for a month. She's supposed to leave next week and I hope so before I go crazy. But then next week Gerald's sister arrives for a few days. And so on ad infinitum. Maybe I'd better move to Shanghai. They won't let visitors come there now.

Gerald is still in Bakersfield. He's been there a month now so I have had all the entertaining on my hands and to complicate things he has the car with him and I have to depend on taxis which is decidedly a nuisance because I have to wait for them.

My sympathies and I hope you and Nell survive the Festschriften. I wish I could be with you at Christmas but I have my doubts.

Sincerely,

4 Tudor Hall
4825 Center Ave.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dr. E. D. Merrill,
New York Botanical Garden,
New York City

Dear Dr. Merrill:

I shall be able to begin the preparation of the manuscript on the Umbelliferae for the 'North American Flora' at the present time if the scholarship stipend you mention will cover my expenses during the preliminary part of the work. I should prefer a financial arrangement for the duration of the work but this scholarship arrangement may prove satisfactory for the present. Naturally I should appreciate as large a stipend as possible.

My situation in Pittsburgh is unique in that I have no official appointment with any institution and thus have to bear the greater part of my research expenses myself which makes a remuneration of some sort essential.

As I mentioned in my letter of January 16th I have working facilities in the herbarium of Carnegie Museum. Loans of specimens will be institutional loans to the museum in care of Dr. Jennings.

I already have a number of North American species of Umbelliferae in manuscript and possibly half of the total number well in mind. A conservative estimate of the number to be included in the 'North American Flora' is about 750 native species and probably some 50 more introduced species. No complete study has been made in recent years of Mexican, Central American, and West Indian species and most of the problems will be in that group. I am at present working over Dr. Rose's unpublished notes on Umbelliferae and they cover some Mexican and West Indian genera.

I am planning to spend some time in New York either in May or June to consult literature and herbarium specimens. However, if advisable, I might be able to come early in April to discuss the work on the Umbelliferae with you.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred E. Mathias