



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.

to Bessey

State Museum of Natural History.

Albany, N. Y. Oct. 25th 1884

My Dear Sir;

I should refer
No 51 to *Solenia anomala* (Pers) Fr
It does not differ essentially from
"*Solenia ochracea*" 611 Ellis N. A. Burgi
but yet it does not agree with the
description of *S. ochracea* as given by
Pries. Its color is not ochraceous nor
is it scattered in its mode of growth,
so that I prefer to consider it as
given above. It seems that Berkeley
is disposed to regard *S. ochracea* as
a mere variety of *S. anomala* so
that the two probably run close together.
But I have specimens which I regard as
S. ochracea, which are much more
clearly ochraceous in color than these.
No 52 I refer to *Physarium*

polymorphum (Mont) - a form
rather larger than usual and subsessile.
It is a variable species anyway.

53 Polyporus fumosus Fr.

Very truly Yours
Chas. C. Peck.