



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Contact: Archives
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 version of an item from our Archives.

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.

answered Oct. 11, 1895.

Lebanon Springs N.Y.
Oct 7 1895

Prof. L. H. Dewey

Dear Sir:-

In reply to yours of Oct 5
I am sorry that the liveforever is as yet alive.

I did not succeed in obtaining specimens of diseased plants and hence no experiments were undertaken. My attention was first drawn to this idea by a note on page 235 of the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1892. I wrote a letter of inquiry asking for material for experiment and received a reply from Prof. Galloway which you will find under date of Oct. 10, 1893. The answer was to the effect that Mr. Fairchild, who had been investigating the disease, had, from press of other duties, been obliged to drop it and as he was about to go abroad for several years it was doubtful if anything farther was done with it. This is the last that I ever heard of it.

The weed is still common enough here

but I find that it is more plentiful on certain soils:—thus on the eastern side of the valley where the soil is clay loam and the red rock line the plant is rarely very troublesome—for instance on our place of some 250 A. there are but three or four small stands of it—but on the western side where the soil is more gravelly and the bed rock slate it is much more abundant and is often complained of by the farmers who have now and then sought to eradicate it by plowing at various seasons and in various ways but without any lasting success.

I have never observed any destructive disease on it here although it may occur and have escaped my attention.

If I could obtain material I would be glad at any time to experiment with it here and should hope that some good results might be had.

Hoping this will explain the present state of the case I am

yours sincerely
Arthur F. Harrison
Lebanon Springs Col. Co., N. Y.