



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.



Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

Boston, Feb. 17.

Dear Prof.:

Today I have
heard from Berkeley.

He says of the
Polyhous sent him
"Grammett (Towa) - 32"

I believe this is Polyhous
obtusus, B. am. nat. hist.

"11-1.390. notwithstanding
the acute margin. I
have no specimen to compare.

So! as the Germans say.
Certainly, I have no
specimen of *P. obtusus* and
if Berkeley the describer
has not been so.

Yours, in haste

W. G. Fernald



WRITE THE ADDRESS ON THIS SIDE—THE MESSAGE ON THE OTHER



Prof. C. E. Bessey,
of ~~Asolo~~
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minn.

I sent yesterday a copy of my
paper on algae. There will be
hundred copies later but I can't
wait any longer and send out
unbound copies at once. The paper
will be for sale at the Naturalists'
Bureau, Salem. Did you get
the alg. am. Bos. all right?
Yours, truly,
W. G. Farrow



WRITE THE ADDRESS ON THIS SIDE—THE MESSAGE ON THE OTHER



Prof. C. E. Beesly,
Ames,
Iowa.

11c

Dear Prof. Beasey, Many thanks
for your volume which has
just been received this morning.
I have been obliged to leave Cambridge
for a few days having been quite
used up and returned this
morning. Yours, truly,
W. G. Harlow.



7 P.M.

WRITE THE ADDRESS ON THIS SIDE-THE MESSAGE ON THE OTHER



*Prof. C. E. Bessey,
Ames,
Iowa.*

Dear Prof.: Your letter arrived
two days ago. The puff ball from
your description I should say was
either *Lycopodium caelatum* or
L. cyathiforme. In the former the
spores are olive coloured. In the latter
purplish. Did you find spores.

Yours, truly
W. G. Harlow

172



BOSTON
MASS.
APR. 19. 7
10 A.M.



WRITE THE ADDRESS ON THIS SIDE—THE MESSAGE ON THE OTHER

Prof. C. E. Bessey,
Ames,
Iowa.

I find that I have charged you
too much for Tuckermans
Synopsis judging from a Dutch
catalogue. You may have it for
\$1.75 instead of \$3.00. Mr. Fargut
has let me have the copy of Andersen's
Salices which he took from the Curtis
Coll. and I will send with the rest.
W. G. Farlow

Cambridge, Jan. 30.

Dear Prof.;

Your letter was duly received but I have been very busy and have not found time to answer before today.

I examined the specimens you enclosed but found them still too young to do any thing ^{more} ~~with~~ ^{useful} authentic which is the same as your plant. *U. Setaria* ^{Rab.} seems to me to differ but very little if any from it. The specimen marked *S. punctiformis* to which I referred in connection with

Pova Specimens is Curtis's
determination. I doubt
whether it is the true plant
which is very common, however,
Yours, in haste,
W. G. Farlow,

Boston, Feb. 13.

Dear Prof.;

Your letter reached me safely and I am much obliged for the fungus. It is *Puccinia Gentianae*, Lk. I hope some time to give a synopsis of Am. Uredineae as I am working on the subject. I shall have a paper about May 1st which will practically be a beginning of the subject including two genera. I have one article now in press which I will send.

The number of Am. *Peronosporae* has increased, *P. obliqua* on *Rumex* being mentioned by Peck in his

last report, and we have found
some new ones not yet
published. Peck describes a
new species on *Geranium* which
he calls *P. Geranii*. Judging from
the description, however, it seems
to be only the *P. nivea* of my article
a year ago.

Yours, truly,
W. G. Harlow

Cambridge, March 6.

Dear Prof. Beesey; I congratulate
you ~~you~~ the occupation of
your new laboratory. How did
it happen that the economical
legislature of Iowa allowed you
such a luxury?

Halsted's paper on ~~Chlorophyll~~ ^{Chlorophyll} ~~as a green color~~

The systematic part of it is to
be published by the Boston Nat.
Hist. Soc. They will print it
very soon. Halsted himself I
suppose is in Chicago but
I have not heard directly from
him for some time.

The Chytridiaceae were
originally an order of unicellular
parasites inhabiting water
plants, as Desmids, Conyzae
& Alex. Brann's memoir.

Ueber Chytridium first brought
them into notice. Hyphotrium
only differs apparently in
inhabiting land plants.

Entyloma is one of the
Ustilaginaceae and includes
most of the old Protonyces,
Phyodermis &c.

My work is now at
the press. I shall leave for Baltimore
in about three weeks I
hope, to remain until June.
During June, I hope to
finish up the third fascicle
of Ellis's Fungi. He tells me that
he has sold but few copies.

I hope when a while that
set is being issued to publish
a paper on N. a. Ustilaginiae.
I have a new and very interesting
Ustilagin from Florida.

Wishing you all
manner of luck in your
new laboratory, I am,

Yours, truly,
W. C. Farrow.

I send a few specimens
not of any thing new but
mostly Eastern forms of
Blasium *var. virgatum* *var. longum*
already sent me.

The lists enclosed are
of *Potentilla norvegica*. It
is the "*Urtica herbarum*"
of Alb. & Schmidt. The *Phacelia*
repandum of some.

Cambridge, Mass. 13.

Dear, Prof. Beesey; I send a
leaf of Potatae with *P. infectans*.
I have not examined this particular
leaf with the microscope and
so cannot swear to the *Peronospora*.
If it does not prove to be
good I will try another.

I have not seen any
account of the germination
of *Peronospora* oospores other
than what you mention as to
Smith. I have given up having
any opinion about his work
since the Coprinus development
business which was too bad
for anything. I suppose your

noticed that the spores of
the *P. infestans* developed in
a "cancer" in which the water
was kept in a sloping
position"! Under such conditions
one might expect anything.

I have secured a copy
of Gilbert's Exerc. which contains
the "*Cecoma Bitatum*" to
which I presume the fungus on
Polygonum must be referred.
Several days ago I heard
that it would be forwarded
in a box which leaves Haue
in a few days.

My address at
Baltimore will be simply
Biological Lab. John
Hopkins Univer.

Yours, in haste
W. C. Turlow.

Baltimore, Apr. 26.

Dear Prof. Beasey, I have
heard from Germany that
the fungus on Polygonum
is thought to be *T. bullatum*
but I have my suspicions
that the opinion has been
reached rather hastily and
as I saw before, my specimen
of *Libert* does not seem to
me to be exactly the same.

I shall stay here until
June 1st lecturing. Mr. Arthur
is now here. What sort of
a botanist did you find

Amir to tee? How old is he?

Yours, in haste

W. G. Harlow
132 W. Madison St.
Baltimore.

Cambridge, May 26.

Dear Prof. Bessey,

The specimen
you send as Rumex are
Ramularia shovata Tuckel
(vid. Buessey Bulletin Vol. 11 p. 13
and Proc. Am. Acad. Feb. 13. 1878)
which may possibly be
included under R. macrospora
Fres. It is the Peronospora
obliqua Cooke and of Peck's
Kept. but is not a Peronospora
at all. Said by Tuckel to be
the conidia of Sphaerella
Rumicis (Desm.) Tuckel but
not certain.

I have had all Prof. Goodale's

classes and have been
frightfully busy but the
lectures end next week.
I wish to examine the
Uredo and Uromyces you
sent once more before
replying. I was sorry to
see in the Bot. Gaz. that
your laboratory had been
badly damaged.

In haste,
W. G. Harlow.

to Bessey

Cambridge, May 27.

Dear Prof.;

It never rains
but pours. Two days before
the arrival of your letter
with specimen of black
knot, I received an
undoubted specimen of the
knot on *P. serotina* found
at Waltham Mass.

Enclosed a piece of
Potentilla Norvegica with
the Phacidium which is the
same as that you sent. It
appears to be pretty common
at Newton. In haste
W. C. Fernald.

Boston, June 23rd

Dear Prof;

I enclose a few specimens of *Accidium Berberidis* which you asked for. I am at work on fungi particularly Uredineae. We have found two new *Pteropus* this spring. Halsted is now in Michigan where he is to assist Prof. B. Caldwell in botanical work. Without help I do not know how I shall get along with my collecting. Has *Puccinia Anemone* turned up yet?

Yours, truly,

W. G. Harlow
cc St. James and
until July 8th then care of Woodford & Harlow

34
Dunstable
Mass

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

an Ustilago which I thought
also U. destruens. The latter is
what is known as U. Rakenhorstiana
taken according to some authorities.
For my part I have been uncertain
what to say about it. I have
been looking over the numerous
Ustilagoes in Rakenh. Fung. Europ.
and I must confess that
I do not so clearly see that
U. destruens and U. Rakenhorstiana
are so distinct. The former has
~~no~~ ^{few} spiculae seen only with a
high power; the latter has more
^{or more distinct spiculae}.
What it all amounts to I
cannot say. I do not clearly
see the difference. The truth is
that a number of transcendental
species, as I call them, have
been made by German botanists
out of the different forms

found all Panicum and related
grasses. I will not now say that
I would unite them all but
evidently several must be
united.

Did you see Winter's
note calling attention to Lesslie's
note in the Annales in which he
gives his reason for changing
Calceoladia to Microsphaera
not sphaeria as Roumeguières
declares and as Cogg. pretends
to have been the case. There is
no authority for Microsphaeria.
I have ~~on~~ ⁱⁿ ~~Calceoladia~~ ^{Calceoladia} ~~on~~ ⁱⁿ my papers. I shall stay
here as long as the weather
permits. Arthur came last
week.

Yours, in haste
W. D. Harlow.

Wood's Hall, Aug. 21.

Dear Prof. Bessey,

Your letter
and specimen were duly
received. The Peronospora on
~~Eupatorium~~^{Eupatorium} seems to me to be
P. obducens Schroeter. When found
on the cotyledons it is apt to be
very obducens but on the leaves
with us as in your specimen
it is scattered.

I am very glad to hear
that the other Peronospora
was found on a plant which you
have been able to recognize with
certainty. I do not believe
at all that species of Peronospora

are limited to plants of one
natural order. I think we ought
to be guided in the first place
by the morphological character
and do not believe in separating
forms which can only be
distinguished by their
parasitism on different hosts.
I have just found *P. gangliiformis*
on *Nahalaus* and some more
P. on *Geranium* besides one or
two interesting *Uredinei* at
Wood's Hall.

Yours, truly

W. E. Yarrow

Do you have a *Puccinia*
on *Gnaphalium* sp. with you?

Cambridge,
Sept. 15.

My dear Prof. Bessey,
Yours of the
11th has just been received
and in the same mail a
letter from Trelease in regard
Prof. William. Have I not
seen Mr. Williams? There
was a younger man who
called at the Herbarium in
July whose name was
Williams. He said that he
was with Prof. Macmillan
and was interested in
lichens. With him was a
lady whom I took to be his

sister, perhaps his wife. They were both short.

I shall be very glad to do what I can for Prof. Wilkins. He can look up lichens in the Tuckerman Coll. or in my own or the Gray Coll. Tuckerman's lichens are in good condition for study although the saxicolous forms are rather better sheltered in drawers just as they were left by Tuckerman. I have not yet had time to arrange them to correspond to those on sheets but shall do so as soon as I can.

Do you know when and in what way Prof. Wilkins intends to come? One can come as a visiting botanist to consult the lichens but if he wishes to do culture work

to Bessey 15-18.

it will be necessary to be
enrolled in the Graduate
Department.

I have not yet been
able to leave Cambridge this
summer owing to family
and business matters. My
brother has now returned
from Europe and I shall
go away at once to be
gone a fortnight to get
a little rest for I am rather
used up.

I'm haste,
W. G. Farlow.

Who is E. W. Holway? He asked me
for some pamphlets on fungi? Is he a
student of yours? I suppose the Peronospora
on Eupatorium Cambridge, Oct. 26.
to Bessey

Dear Prof.;

Again I am at home
and, to a certain extent, settled
down for winter work. Your
letter with the Ustilago was
received at Gloucester. I examined
the specimen at the time and
have examined it again today
but only find one thing, the
Ustilago intriculosa. The
Curtis specimens of Ustilago
are not to be trusted. I saw
a bit of the real U. intriculosa
which grew at Newton, Mass.
Perhaps the Curtis specimens
you have are really U. Candollei
which also occurs on Polygonum.

What I find in the specimens
to correspond to your drawing
are the young stages of the
Huterea. The young spores are
not reticulated and are in
a sac, not an ascus however.
The development has been too
well made out to allow one
to place the Huterea with
the ascogones. I agree with
you that I see no particular
reason for placing them near
the Uredineae. What was said
about Pachysoma referred to a
paper with plates which I
presented to the Boston Nat. History
Society last winter. Publication
was delayed because I wished
to repeat my experiments last
spring which I did. as soon as
I can find time the thing will
go to press.

*By a slip of the pen I believe
I wrote Ustilago Setariae
instead of U. neglecta in the
specimen I sent a short
time ago. I now enclose a
list of Sporisorium bullatum
from Cambridge.

Ellis writes that you
will furnish Puccinia amorphae
and U. neglecta. I have
enough of the latter if you
have not. Have you any
Phaeophora atrovirens?

Yours, in haste,

M. G. Fernald

I have myself about 75
species for Mass. III of N.A. Hays.
If you wish to know what
I have, I can send a list.

Cambridge, Dec. 7.

Dear Prof.,

I presume you are very busy indeed. I am myself. I suppose that Ellis's third fasciculus will be distributed presently, the labels must be about done.

I have just finished my Lowell Lecture and am putting what time I can get on to algae. In the spring I shall return to fungi of which I have a number of new things. I suppose you received Habet's paper all right.

In haste, W. C. Harlow.

1878

Cambridge, Apr. 7,

Dear Prof. Bessey;

My copy
of *Libert's Plantes Crypt.*
Arduum has arrived and
I have compared your
specimen on *Polygonum*
with the *Cocconia Bistatorum*
= *Tilletia bullata* the no 88
of *Libert*. The general appearance
of the con is the same but
the spores in your specimen
are smaller. Can your specimen
be young? I hardly think so.
If my opinion is correct, I
should say that yours is
either new or a new variety.

of the *Tilletia bullata*. I shall
write again. I leave for
Baltimore on Thursday
Yours, in haste,
W. G. Harlow.

to Bessey

1878

Cambridge, Aug. 31

Dear Prof., I write in great haste as I leave to join the Fish Commission at Gloucester this afternoon. No. 1. is very interesting. a microscopic examination makes me think that the fungus is Rhizogon rubescens, but some more details of colour and general appearance when fresh are necessary to the complete diagnosis. No. 2. is the mycelial form to which the name of Ogonium auricomum Lk. is applied. No. 3. Roestelia lacerata, Fr.

4. *Uromyces appendiculatus*
The Peronospora on Eupatorium
delights me. It is the same
that Halsted found two years
ago in the Bussy Woods. He only
got a very little. I have just
found the same species on
ambrosia and it appears
common with us. I have
been able to trace the development
of the spores.

I have just found
Ustilago Petalovae & *U. destructans*
abundant in Cambridge, also
a very little *Sorosporium bullatum*.
I send bits of some of the

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

Yours, in haste,
W. G. Farlow.

Memorandum of Spores sent
to the authors: Aug 8. 1878

No 1. Hydnangium ?

No 2. Brown brain-like
material. from the Glean.

No 3. Roestelia on Pyrus
Coronaria

No 4. Wrenches appendicularis
on Phacelia, etc.

No 5. Cercospora nigra ?
on Eupatorium purpureum

from Trelow

1881

Cambridge, Mass. ^{Apr. 1. 4.} Jan. 1.

Dear Prof. Bessey,
Your letter
was received by me while I
was in Bermuda and I have
not been able to find any
time to reply until today.
With regard to *Puccinia*
microspora, it first appeared
in Curtis's North Carolina
Plants in 1867. The name is
wrongly given in *Flora Am.*
as *P. microspora*. Wierherd

am responsible for the mistake
originally I do not know, but
as all *entazon* specimens are
labelled *P. microsperma*, I do not
think it likely that I on this
occasion only spelled it
microspora but it is certainly
my fault for not calling
the attention of Ellis to the
mistake. Whether ^{the} species
is *P. lobeliae* of Gerard I cannot
say but think it likely. I have
written to Gerard on that
point. If you find other
errors in Cent. III I shall be
very glad to hear them as I
am preparing a number
paper for the academy as a
commentary on the forms pub-
lished in Cent. III with a
revision of the N.A. species
of some of the genera.

to Bessey 4-IV-1891

The specimen on Yernonia
is the P. Yernoniae of Schumannitz
and it would be a nice
thing for the next century, I
still think, however, from
an examination of the specimen
last sent that the species
is not distinct from P. Heliantha.

Schroeter has expressed
no opinion to me on P. Graminis
var. brevicarpa.

With regard to the
Alg. Ann. Bot. I am not
certain whether I can furnish
a whole set. There is a
set minus part I; II & III
are in good condition. Part
IV will appear in a fortnight.

I hardly know whether
you would care for an
incomplete set.

I presume that you
have received my *Gymno-*
sporangium paper. It is
no 1. of a set on *Uredineae*
and two other genera
will soon follow.

Yours, in haste
W. G. Harlow.

classification & description of the American species of Characeae; by B. S. Halsted.

The paper I have alluded to, relating to the American Characeae appeared in the Journal in 1873, viz: the "Brief notes of the Charae of North America," Prof. Wm. Braun, Commissioner of Agriculture. Two years later a notice of American Charae appeared in a note to *Plantae Lindheimerianae*, published in the Boston Journal of Natural History. Since that date we have only scattered references to Charae in local lists & reports, of different expeditions, until within the last few years when the attention of botanists has been more frequently turned to the species of this small but interesting order. The task of determining native species will be much facilitated by two books which have recently appeared. One by Dr. J. J. Abbot entitled *Characeae Americanae*, an illustrated work of which two parts have appeared, has already been noticed in this Journal. The other, originally presented as a graduating thesis at Harvard University in May 1878, by B. S. Halsted, is now published in part in the proceedings of the Boston Society of Natural History. There is a short introduction, giving a general account of the structure of the order, followed by detailed descriptions of the 13 species known to the writer from an examination of the Herbaria at Cambridge and a number of private collections. of the species 8, belong to *Stettin*, 1. to *Tolypella*, and 9. to *Chara*. one new species *C. Robinsonii* is described. among the more interesting species, we may mention *C. gelatinosa* found by Kennel in the Baiter Canal & the beautiful *C. Gymnopus*, var. *elyans*, which was first found & called in Essex County, Massachusetts, where it has recently been rediscovered by Mr. Robinson; & it is now known in other localities as a variety. The paper shows indications of careful study, & there is only one portion which we would criticize.

The group of the *Gymnopus* in which *C. Gymnopus* & *C. Robinsonii* should be compared with *C. Tolypella* var. *Michauxii*, Braun, which as it seems to me, may have been compared with what Mr. Halsted calls *C. Michauxii* (the type of *C. Gymnopus*).

It should also be compared with *C. Sejuncta*, Braun, a species certainly approaching *C. Robinsonii*.

The literature of the old *C. Michauxii* & *C. Sejuncta* is very obscure, & these two species figure unpleasantly in the footnotes of inaccessible articles, but we hope to have eventually from Mr. Halsted a further elucidation of the *Gymnopus*.
W. G. F.

1880
Cambridge, July 13.

Dear Prof. Bessey, I was
very sorry that I did
not see you yesterday.
There are very many things
which I wished to show
you and I wanted you
to help yourself to duplicates
which you could have
selected. I understood that
you would be at my laboratory
in the morning and I
remained there from 9 until
1 o'clock. After dinner it
was too hot to stay there

and I went to my ~~room~~
in the Holyoke House
where I remained until
6 o'clock. I found your
card on going out to tea.
I am sorry that you
did not call to me
from the sidewalk as I
should probably have
heard you.

I regret that your
reception here was so
inhospitable on my part
for it is so seldom that
I see you that I do
not like to have you
slip away without a
good chance to talk over
the many things of
common interest. Cambridge
is at least a disadvantageous
place for visitors, particularly

so in summer but another
season I shall be
in condition to make you
more comfortable as I
shall have a room to offer
you.

For myself I have
been constantly in a
state of confusion in my
work owing to circumstances
over which I have had no
control. Last night I
heard from the publishers
of Gray's series and I have
positively declined to do
~~more work~~ for them
under the circumstances
as they now stand and
under no circumstances
will I continue my work
for them this summer.
I return at once to my

own choice Uredineae and
Ustilagineae and shall
now push forward my
papers on those subjects
and you may expect
something before long. The
bracketted part is for
your own ear but please do
not speak publicly of what
I write.

Yours, in haste,
W. G. Harlow

1860

Cambridge,

Nov. 19.

Dear Prof. Bessey,

Does the Naturalist
receive the Annals of
Botany? Or do you
already take it yourself?
If not, would you
like to exchange? If so,
I will exchange with
you. I say "I" because
the Annals has a
system of exchange
and I have agreed

to subscribe for two
copies besides my own
— the editors by-the-way
pay for their own copies
— which I shall see
for exchange.

Yours, truly
W. G. Fairlove

1890

Cawlinch Nov. 27.

Dear Prof. Bessey,

I have ordered
a copy of the Annals to
be sent to you beginning
with Vol. III of which
3 parts have already
appeared. If the numbers
do not arrive in a
month please let me
know. I should be glad
to get the Naturalist of
this year in exchange.

I have had a hard
year. Two of my family
have died including my

father. My work here
has been beyond my
powers and everything
was in confusion awaiting
the completion of our
new building. I now have
comfortable quarters but
it will be months before
I am really settled. Middle
age has its drudgery
and I long for leisure.
Next year is my leave
of absence.

Yours, truly,
W. C. Harlow

1893
Cambridge
March 10.

Dear Prof. Bessey,

I have herewith
for your copy of
Annals for coming year.
If numbers do not
reach you all right,
please let me know.

So there an Index
of volumes of Am. Naturalist
is sent. I have not
received indexes for
1892 and 1893.

Yours truly,
W. G. Farlow.

1894

Cambridge,
April 10.

Dear Prof. Bessey,

I am greatly
obliged to you for
the trouble you have
taken in regard to the
Index of the Naturalist.
After I wrote to you
the April number of
Naturalist came and
with it was the Index
for 1893 so that my
volumes are all right
now. Yours, truly
N. G. Farlow.

Cawlinidj
April 1,
1897.

Dear Prof. Bessey,

I have this
winter been busy
trying to set the
herbarium to rights
and have come across
a specimen you
sent several years
ago which I did
not recognize at the
time. I enclose a
piece which you

will recognize.

On reexamining
today, I see that
the specimen is a
mixture of two
species Sphaerosporium
lignatile Schw. and
Rhinotrichum Curtisii
Berk. The Sphaeros-
porium I find occa-
sionally here but,
in your specimen,
it is to some extent
masked by the presence
of the Rhinotrichum
and I did not
at first recognize

What it was,

Yours, truly,
W. G. Farlow,

Harvard University
HERBARIUM AND LABORATORIES
OF
CRYPTOGAMIC BOTANY

W. G. Folley, 24 Quincy Street
R. Thaxter, 7 Scott Street



Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

Dec. 13. 1906

Dear Prof. Bessey,

After serving as assistant editor of the *Annals of Botany* for the twenty years since it was started I have resigned the position feeling that twenty years was as long a time as one ought to serve in such a capacity. Prof. Thaxter will replace me and his name will appear on the title page of the next volume. Although the copy of the *Annals* which was sent you was paid for out of my own pocket (since I felt that there should be some copies given in exchange in this country and the rules of exchange only allowed exchanges with journals whose price was the same as that of the *Annals*) I now feel that I shall have to discontinue all my subscriptions except for my own personal copy as my journal bill

has become very large. All the editors
of the annals pay for their own copies,
a curious arrangement according
to our ideas.

I have not seen you son
since he was married but my
wife and I would like very much
to see both him and his wife. I am
glad that I have not got to be
away this coming Christmas week.
For the last three years I have
had to take long journeys and
spend a good deal of time which
needed to be spent on my work.

at home.

Yours, very truly,
W. G. Farrow.

Cambridge

Jan. 25,
1914.

Dear Prof. Bease,

I certainly am
a very wretched corres-
pondent and my letters
are like ~~as~~ angels'
visits in one respect
and one respect only; they
are few and far
between. I am now
writing to thank you
for your "Reviews of
Land Plant Phyla" which
you sent more than
a month ago.

I did not go to the
atlanta meeting fortunately
for, had I been away
for a week at that
time, I don't know
when I ever should
have caught up with
my work.

With respects of my
wife and myself to
Mrs. Beasey, Dear,
Yours very truly
W. G. Shalor

Harvard University
HERBARIUM AND LABORATORIES
OF
CRYPTOGAMIC BOTANY

W. G. Farlow, 24 Quincy Street
R. Thaxter, 7 Scott Street



Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.

Oct. 1, 1916

Dear Dr. Peltier,

On returning to Cambridge
I find the copy of your valuable
paper on Parasitic Rhizoctonia in
America for which I am greatly
obliged. Yours, very truly,
W. G. Farlow.